

338092

JPRS-TAC-86-075

18 SEPTEMBER 1986

## Worldwide Report

# ARMS CONTROL

19990416 131

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**  
Approved for Public Release  
Distribution Unlimited

**FBIS** FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE  
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

8  
106  
AΦ6

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

18 SEPTEMBER 1986

## WORLDWIDE REPORT

### ARMS CONTROL

#### CONTENTS

##### SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Soviet Military Journal Assesses Implications of Eureka  
(V. Yakunin; Moscow AVIATSIYA I KOSMONAVTIKA, No 5, May 86),. 1

U.S., USSR Discussions at Scientific Cooperation Symposium  
(Rome ANSA, 20 Aug 86)..... 4

##### U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

PRAVDA: 'Doubt Whether Intelligent Life Exists' in Washington  
(V. Volshakov; Moscow PRAVDA, 25 Aug 86)..... 5

##### SALT/START ISSUES

PRAVDA Chief Editor Interviewed on SALT II  
(Viktor Afansyev Interview; Prague Television Service,  
9 Jun 86)..... 9

TASS Charges 'Manipulation' of Harris Poll on SALT  
(Igor Ignatyev; Moscow TASS, 23 Aug 86)..... 12

##### INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PRAVDA Criticizes NATO Attempts To Justify Missile Deployments  
(Yu. Kharlanov; Moscow PRAVDA, 10 Aug 86)..... 14

## CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR's Gerasimov: U.S. May Block CD Agreement To Ban CW (Moscow TASS, 22 Aug 86).....	16
--	----

## CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Soviet Commentator on Senate Vote on Binary Weapons (Vadim Biryukov; Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN, 19 Aug 86).....	17
Afghan Captive Alleges U.S. Use of Chemical Arms (Prague RUDE PRAVO, 16 Aug 86).....	18

## EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

Soviet Army Paper Accuses West of 'Unconstructive' MBFR Stance (S. Vilkov, Yu. Borin; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 26 Aug 86)...	20
USSR Military Journal on Warsaw Pact as Shield Against Aggression (V. Ovsyannikov; Moscow AVIATSIYA I KOSMONAVTIKA, No 5, May 86).....	23
USSR: Late August Reports, Comments on CDE (Various sources, various dates).....	28
Gen Tatarnikov Interviewed	28
Results Tied to 'Military Restrictions', by Vladimir Bogchev, Nikolay Vukolov	31
Bloc Initiatives Defended, by Vladimir Bogachev, Nikolay Vukolov	32
Notification Principle Agreed	33
FRG Paper Calls Verification Key to Disarmament Negotiations (Frankfurter FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG, 21, 22 Jul 86)..	35
No Compromise at MBFR, by Jan Reifenberg	35
CDE Nears September Conclusion, by Horst Bacia	37

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: White House 'Displeased' at Arms Curb Publicity (A. Shalnev; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 23 Aug 86).....	41
USSR: Further Commentary on Moratorium Extension (Various sources, various dates).....	43
IZVESTIYA Editorial	43
Petrosyants on Verification, by Andranik Petrosyants	45
'Control' of Ban Noted	47
U.S. Public Opinion, by Tomas Kolesnichenko	47

Moscow Demonstration	48
Further Report	48
Dailies Comments Reviewed	50
PRAVDA Commentary, by Yuriy Zhukov	52
IZVESTIYA Round Table, Gene LaRocque, Mikhail Milshteyn	
Interview	56
Benefits of Joint Ban Viewed, by I. Zakharov	59
'Giving U.S. Time To Reflect', by G. Dadyants	61
U.S. Arguments Rebutted, by Spartak Beglov	63
U.S. 'Puts Cart Before Horse, by Boris Shabayev	65
USSR Will 'Ensure Security', by N. Chervov	66
PRAVDA Weekly Review, by Yevgeniy Grigoryev	68
'International Observers Round Table', by	
Vadim Borisovich Kassis, et al.	72
White House 'Incompatible Statements, by Valentin Zorin	80
APN Commentary, by Enver Mamedov	81
SDI Connection Noted, by Aleksandr Zholkver	83
U.S. 'Nuclear Fanaticism', by Gennadiy Gerasimov	84
British Attitude Hit, by Nikolay Borin	85
Message From Thatcher	86
London TIMES Cited, by A. Maslennikov	87
UN Circulates Gorbachev Speech	87
Washington 'In Growing Isolation'	88
 Moscow Press Conference on Moratorium Extension	
(Various sources, 25-27 Aug 86).....	89
 TV Broadcast, by Yuliy Vorontsov, et al.	89
TASS Report	94
Question, Answer Session	96
 Netherlands Paper on U.S. Objections To Testing Moratorium	
(Editorial; Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD, 19 Aug 86).....	99
 PNG's Foreign Minister Promotes Nuclear-Free Zone	
(Noel Pascoe; Port Moresby PAPUA NEW GUINEA POST COURIER,	
15 Aug 86).....	101

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET MILITARY JOURNAL ASSESSES IMPLICATIONS OF EUREKA

Moscow AVIATSIYA I KOSMONAVTIKA in Russian No 5, May 86 (signed to press 2 Apr 86) p 45

[Article, published under the heading "Readers Request," by Col V. Yakumin:  
"Eureka"]

[Text] Having advanced the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" three years ago, the Reagan Administration, employing its favorite tactics of persuasion, promises and behind-the-scenes arm twisting, proceeded with an all-out effort to "work on" its NATO allies as well as the governments of Australia, Japan and Israel, with the aim of enlisting them to participation in the "Star Wars" program. Things reached the point where in March of last year the United States sent to these countries letters with a proposal in the form of an ultimatum: to inform the Americans within 2 months of their desire to participate in the program.

U.S. allies responded to this demand in different ways. It did not take much argument to persuade the Thatcher Government and Chancellor Kohl's cabinet, for example, to take part in the overseas plans to militarize space. Italy did not give its consent until March of this year, while Belgium, Portugal, Israel, and other countries are still "thinking it over." But the governments of France, Denmark, Norway, and Canada have stated that they will not take part in SDI.

At the same time French President Mitterand, in response to the U.S. ultimatum, proposed that the West European countries form a "European agency for the coordination of scientific and technical research," called Project Eureka. According to the president's statement, this project constitutes a group of scientific research programs, the practical implementation of which should in the current decade substantially lessen the technological gap between Western Europe on the one hand and the United States and Japan on the other, in such advanced fields as electronics, biotechnology, automated systems, the aerospace industry, robot engineering, and laser technology. In short, the goal is to protect the European economy against excessive dependence on U.S. and Japanese technologies.

Proceeding from political considerations, France is determinedly stressing the "civilian" thrust of its initiative, although French officials do not rule out

the possibility that results achieved in carrying out Project Eureka could in the future find application in the military area.

French proposals for Project Eureka include West European joint research on three principal programs: "Euromatique" -- development of supercomputers; Eurobot -- development of third-generation robots; Eurocom -- development of modern communications systems; Eurobio -- utilization of new biotechnology methods in agriculture and medicine; and Euromat -- development of new structural materials.

The first intergovernmental conference on Project Eureka was held in Paris last July, attended by the ministers of foreign affairs and scientific research of 17 countries (Belgium, Denmark, France, the United Kingdom, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, FRG, Austria, Spain, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, and Finland) and European Community commission members. As was reported, the main result of the conference was approval given by all participants to the French plan and its principal scientific research program areas. According to one of the ministers this date, 17 July, became the birthday of Eureka.

At the same time the conference results indicated that the countries participating in the project have been encountering a great many major problems of an organizational and financial nature. Great Britain maintains, for example, that the Eureka program should be financed exclusively by private industry, while France advocates government financing and the FRG favors a combination, with a majority role, however, played by private industry. In confirmation of this, France announced a government budget appropriation of 1 billion francs this year for Eureka, while the FRG announced a budget appropriation of 50 million marks (120 million francs).

The French are moving fairly cautiously in advancing their initiative, endeavoring not to antagonize potential partners, particularly the FRG and Britain. They are stressing that Eureka is not directed against SDI, and consequently parallel participation by West European countries in the two programs simultaneously is not ruled out. At the same time it was suggested that the West European countries "not divert" their resources to the U.S. project but become involved in the project of the West European community, that is, in work which will allegedly give them genuine benefit and will prevent a "brain drain" to America.

The second European Intergovernmental Conference on the Eureka Program was held last November in Hannover (FRG), with the participation of 18 countries (Turkey joined the countries listed above). As West German foreign minister Genscher commented, all participants noted with satisfaction the positive response Eureka has evoked directly within European industrial and scientific circles. The general concept of the program and a declaration of principles, stating the goals, criteria, structure and methods of implementation of this program were adopted at the conference.

What will Eureka become for Europe? Will it have a purely peaceful directional thrust or will it become an obvious contributory element toward implementation of the U.S. Star Wars program? No matter how veiled the

statements by officials of Western countries regarding the goals of Project Eureka, one is clear: a high technological level can be achieved as a result of its implementation, which will play an important role for industry of the future and in the conquest of space. The results of practical implementation of each of the areas of scientific research, however, do not rule out the possibility of development of offensive space weaponry and a European ABM system. Will Eureka become a European SDI? The future will tell.

The Soviet Union, working persistently to prevent spread of the arms race into space, proposed at the 40th UN General Assembly Session, as we know, an extensive program to unite the efforts of nations in the peaceful use of space and employment of space technology to meet the economic and social needs of all peoples. One must assume that this concept of "star peace" will be grasped by the European countries and that in the present critical period they will take practical measures to prevent the danger of deployment of weapons in space, which threatens all mankind.

COPYRIGHT: "Aviatsiya i kosmonavtika", 1986.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1537



SDI AND SPACE ARMS

U.S., USSR DISCUSSIONS AT SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION SYMPOSIUM

AU200937 Rome ANSA in English 0847 GMT 20 Aug 86

[Text](ANSA) Erice, Italy, August 19 — A key component of the Reagan administration's Strategic Defense Initiative moved to the center of debate on the second day of the symposium entitled "International Cooperation: The Alternatives", attended by scientists from the United States, the Soviet Union, China and Europe.

American Professor Robert Budwine of the Lawrence Livermore Laboratories, the California research center handling much of the 26-billion-dollar phase of the "star wars" research project, referred to President Ronald Reagan's recent proposal to work along with the Soviets for a space-based missile defense system.

Budwine said that the offer was based on view of scientists that the Soviets had won the race in the development of the x-ray laser, crucial for the operation of the space shield.

Putting an end to doubts on development of the component in the U.S., the scientist said, "now we have these lasers and we are prepared to make available to our Soviet colleagues the results we have achieved".

Oleg Khrokhich, of the Soviet Academy of the Sciences, strongly denied that his country has a working prototype of the x-ray laser. "We have conducted studies but we are still in the theoretical phase", he said.

The consensus among the American delegates here, however, is that the Soviets are in possession of the x-ray laser while the Soviets appeared greatly surprised with the American offer for joint "star wars" research.

Aleksey Arbatov, one of the Soviet scientists here, declared, "a shield is something which serves to defend oneself from the aggression of the other side. If our countries worked jointly, who would we be protecting ourselves from?"

Budwine, responding to the question, said: "From some flying object which could cause harm" and held up a telegram from Edward Teller, the leading U.S. figure in the development of the hydrogen bomb and a presidential adviser as one of the members of the Lawrence Livermore team.

In his telegram, Teller reiterated the offer of cooperation with the Soviets in the development of an anti-missile system.

The offer was again questioned by Arbatov who then referred to the SDI as a factor of "destabilization", as a "new weapon to strike artificial satellites in orbit". He then spoke of the "political decision" required for such a step on cooperation and said, "the political powers always take the opinion of the scientists into account."

/8309

CSO: 5200/2748

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

PRAVDA: 'DOUBT WHETHER INTELLIGENT LIFE EXISTS' IN WASHINGTON

PM261832 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Aug 86 First Edition p 6

[V. Volshakov article: "Seeking Brothers in Reason. Deliberations on the New Thinking in the Nuclear Age"]

[Text] This is not the first time one has felt like comparing international observers with astronomers who have intercepted intriguing signals from outer space and are trying to guess what they may be: a message from a different intelligence or the echo of a space storm?

This kind of comparison becomes increasingly valid as the world situation becomes increasingly tense through the fault of U.S. militarist forces. When the slightest reassuring signal comes from across the ocean in response to the USSR's peace proposals, it is not surprising that the Western press reports this fact as almost the discovery of a new star.

One can understand our Western colleagues. First, the quest for brothers in reason on earth is far more topical for mankind than any such quest in outer space. Second, the West is already in a rather disadvantageous position. Even the bourgeois press writes that during the last year the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have sent a large number of signals testifying that socialism has goodwill and a sensible and just approach to all aspects of terminating the arms race on earth and preventing it in space. If the "capitalist galaxy" to which these signals have been sent had had the willingness to enter a dialogue, a response to even a fraction of the proposals and peace initiatives put forward by us would have already been received a long time ago. Moscow has only just sent a new strong signal of goodwill -- the decision to extend the moratorium on all nuclear explosions until 1 January 1987. Will it produce a reasonable response?

Let us be frank: The recent signals originating, for example, from the center of the U.S. political constellation have not only repeatedly confused political observers but have also discouraged many of them and have made them doubt whether "intelligent life" exists there altogether.

No sooner had Washington reported the "great compromise" on strategic weapons proposed by the United States to the Soviet Union when the White House "clarified" that it does not presuppose a rejection of the "Strategic Defense Initiative," in other words shifting the arms race into space. The question, therefore, is: On what basis is this compromise drawn? Having held the lead in the number of explosions for 40 years, the United States exploded 18 more nuclear devices during the year of the Soviet moratorium.

New nuclear explosions are now being prepared in Nevada in response to the extension of our moratorium through the end of 1986. And it is exactly the same in everything else. The response to the USSR's proposal to reduce strategic arms was the deployment of new types of missiles and missile-carrying submarines. The response to the appeal for the nonmilitarization of space took the form of tests of space weapons. The latest literally took place a few days ago. In a blatant fashion.

One of the main indicators of reason in any civilization is its desire for self-improvement. Hegel wrote a long time ago that the task of philosophy is "to reveal the infinite in everything finite and to demand the perfection of the finite through reason...." Reason would always be opposed to self-destruction. This is inherent in human nature itself, and its effect is felt in the positive reaction to Soviet peace initiatives by people everywhere. The following figure was cited during M.S. Gorbachev's Moscow meeting with representatives of the International Forum of Scientists for Nuclear Test Ban: 56 percent of Americans were already in favor of the United States joining the Soviet moratorium. This figure has risen to 80 percent in the last few days.

In July the U.S. newspaper MERCURY NEWS published the results of an opinion poll conducted among 23,000 residents of 21 countries including the United States, Canada, leading West European states, Brazil, Argentina, India, Japan, Nigeria, and others. The question was asked: "How do you rate the need to sign a U.S.-USSR arms control treaty in the next few years -- very important, important, unimportant, or extremely unimportant," an average of 50 percent in all countries replied "very important" (with 62 percent in the United States, 65 percent in Britain, and so on).

The broad movement of scientists against nuclear war and for disarmament, the refusal by many of them to take part in SDI work, the shift of growing numbers of parliamentarians, leaders of a number of bourgeois political parties, and religious and public figures in Western countries to positions of active champions of peace, and the support for virtually all the recent large-scale peace initiatives by the USSR and the other socialist states at the United Nations testify to the obvious: The new political thinking in the nuclear age is crystallizing in the social conscience of the family of man.

The Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries have put forward a realistic plan for dismantling the ugly forms of weaponry [vooruzhenneskiye obrazovaniya] that place our planet in a situation that deteriorates ecologically, economically, and morally day by day. A realistic time limit has also been proposed for cleansing the earth of nuclear and chemical filth and "conventional" mass destruction weapons -- by the year 2000.

We take into account, of course, the fact that we speak different languages also in politics. But we do believe that mutual understanding is possible. The socialist world proposes not simply the coexistence of states and people on our planet, but peaceful coexistence on a qualitatively new basis.

It is time to put an end to the strategy of "mutually assured destruction" and the "balance of fear," in other words the nightmare of mutual threat. The "balance of fear" is no longer a factor of deterrence. Fear contributes to the arms race and factor of deterrence. Fear contributes to the arms race and creates a vicious circle of whipping up tension. It is time to embark on a new strategy -- mutually assured survival and balance of trust.

The potential of reason and common sense is evident in the peace message addressed by the socialist world to the capitalist "galaxy." M.S. Gorbachev's August statement has opened yet another breach in the blind wall of that galaxy's technological self-confidence and militarist arrogance.

The following turn of phrase has been heard often in speeches by politicians in the last few years: "Rise above ideological differences." Does this mean, our reader may ask, a rejection of our ideals, of our communist ideology and morals, and of our entire world outlook for the sake of ensuring peace on earth and eliminating the nuclear threat? No, of course not. Does it mean, for the capitalist world, reaching compromise with socialism on the entire package of disarmament problems and rejecting its system of values and its social system? No, this is not how the communists pose the question. The anticommunists are the one who pose it this way.

The question of whether mankind is to be or not to be is answered by anticommunist fanatics with the slogan of the "cold war" times: "Better dead than Red." The narrow-mindedness typical of these "crusaders" prevents them from understanding that we are primarily talking about whether any people at all, regardless of their political beliefs, will remain alive. If only matters were as simple as that, if only it were the fanatics alone who thought in this way. At times even some "realists" in the West seem unable to grasp that communists have an equal right with anticommunists to remain alive and to preserve their beliefs and their way of life. Are the ruling circles of the West, whose ideological reference points range from "just to the left of center" to the "extreme right," prepared -- on the basis of recognizing this right of the socialist world -- to do business with it? Can they overcome the inertia of anticommunist thinking and the Sovietophobia that has grown deep roots in bourgeois political thinking?

These are complex questions that cannot be answered comprehensively. Let me single out just a few elements of a possible answer.

In itself, the term "Sovietophobia" (fear of Soviet power and of everything linked with the Soviet Union, and simultaneous hatred of it) goes a long way to explain the attitude of "the powers that be" toward us. It is most graphically evident in the example of the present U.S. Administration. In politics it proceeds from the premise that everything that is good for the USSR is bad for the United States. In the military sphere -- from the necessity to gain military superiority over socialism. The doctrine of U.S. national security is built on the concept of a "decapitating first strike" (clearly a nuclear-missile strike).

What about joining the USSR in pledging not to be the first to deliver a nuclear strike? They are either unwilling or unable to accept this. Unwilling, because it would mean the collapse of the myths about the aggressiveness of communism and the "Marxist plan" to create a "world communist empire" (approximately along the lines of the scenario presented in dozens of varieties in Hollywood movies about the "Soviet invasion" of America). Unwilling, also because this would shake the ideological foundation of the arms race flywheel that produces gigantic profits for the merchants of death. Unable, because they themselves have become captives of these myths, believing them religiously.

What is this if not a vicious circle? Is there a way out of it? Americans love to say that there are at least two ways out of any deadlock. What are the ways out sought in Washington?

So far the Pentagon has not officially admitted that nuclear weapons are virtually unusable. But the "nuclear winter" effect that has been worked out by scientists shows this more and more convincingly. Yet the inertia of militarist thinking in the United

States is powerful and prevents the total rejection of these weapons. The "judgment of Solomon" made by the Pentagon and other strategists advising the President boils down to the following: Yes, it is possible to embark right away on a radical reduction of nuclear weapons, since their use in a military conflict would result in a "Mexican draw" (in R. Reagan's words), in other words in mutual suicide. But, while reducing these weapons, it is necessary to achieve a breakthrough in the development [razrabotka] and production of qualitatively new weapons and to significantly overtake the Russians in this. This, in particular, is the long-term goal of the "star wars" program.

History can teach those who are now rattling their laser guns that these expectations will not materialize. Let the historical argument be resolved by the people and their peaceful labor and not by missiles and lasers. By suggesting a program for the limitation and reduction of USSR and U.S. nuclear arsenals with the subsequent inclusion of other nuclear powers in this process and with the elaboration -- under conditions of the nonmilitarization of space -- of a detailed and well-tuned system of international monitoring of any attempts by any state to either surreptitiously build up or recreate anew its own nuclear arsenal, the socialist world proposes the creation of an all-embracing system of international security. It will guarantee equal security for all. But this requires the complete liquidation of mass destruction means, a ban on space- strike weapons, a ban on antisatellite systems and the elimination of such means already in existence, a radical reduction of "conventional" arsenals, and the ensuring of cooperation between states with different social systems in all spheres.

The Soviet Union proposes a realistic opportunity for this at the very next summit meeting to those Washington leaders who speak of their desire to go down in history as peacemakers. It would be irresponsible to miss this chance. After all, to just rename the MX first-strike missile "Peacekeeper" is not enough to be remembered as a peacemaker by future generations, or even by our contemporaries!

We are not afraid of disarmament or cooperation. Furthermore, we need them. The implementation of our plans for communist building is most directly linked with the preservation of peace. Hence the general stipulation by the CPSU in international affairs: to do everything for the strengthening of peace and the termination of the arms race.

Why are our partners in the disarmament talks afraid of this? They are actually afraid of the historical future. Obviously they do not believe too firmly that capitalism can be retained in the international arena other than by the force of arms.

The key foundation of the new political thinking in our nuclear and space age is indeed contained in the recognition of the obvious fact that it is impossible to change the march of world history to anyone's advantage by force, no matter how threatening this force may be; it is contained in understanding the obvious: The buildup of nuclear arsenals will not only fail to enhance security but could, on the contrary, turn into "zero" security, in other words into total self-destruction. Growing numbers of ordinary people, leaders of developed capitalist countries are becoming aware of this truth. One way or another, Washington will have to take the realities of life into account, they cannot be avoided.

We are gaining growing numbers of brothers in reason on earth. Despite all the differences in their political views and beliefs, they understand how great their responsibility is for the fate of our planet and the future generations of earth's inhabitants.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1458

SALT/START ISSUES

PRAVDA CHIEF EDITOR INTERVIEWED ON SALT II

LD111108 Prague Television Service in Czech and Slovak 1920 GMT 9 Jun 86

[Interview with Academician Viktor Afansyev, editor in chief of PRAVDA and chairman of the Union of Journalists of the USSR, by unidentified correspondent, in the "On a Topical Theme" program; in Prague, time not given; questions and answers in Russian fading into superimposed Czech translation]

[Excerpt] [Question] Comrade Afansayev, at the time you arrived in Prague the world press has been writing about the refusal of the Reagan administration to observe SALT II. What is your view of this decision and what kind of influence will it have on Soviet-American relations and on the envisaged summit between the Soviet Union and the United States?

[Afanasyev] I will begin my reply to this question from the opposite end. Of course, Reagan's decision, starting in the fall, to equip B52 bombers with new missiles, whose number will exceed the maximum agreed in SALT II, does not in any event assist the forthcoming summit meeting. We do not exclude the possibility of this meeting but it must not be an empty and futile meeting. This meeting must resolve at least two or three, or perhaps only one important issue concerning arms control, and, naturally, there has to be an appropriate political climate, and this atmosphere is not being created by decisions such as the refusal to observe SALT II.

There exist in effect two basic agreements: The treaty banning the deployment of offensive weapons in space, and SALT II. Although the latter treaty has not been ratified--the blame for which lies with the U.S. side--it has been observed out of good will for a number of years. The treaty sets the maximum number of carriers of nuclear weapons--1,320 units--and this maximum has been maintained. Thus, for instance, whenever we have included any new missile in our armory or modernized an obsolete one or abandoned an old submarine equipped with nuclear delivery vehicles, we have strictly observed this maximum. And this naturally acted as a brake on the arms race. Today, when Reagan has decided to renounce this limitation we are standing at the outset of a new, totally uncontrollable arms spiral since the treaties and obligations which have been holding back this arms race are ceasing to be effective. This will, of course, have very serious consequences. The United States is today carrying out a whole series of military programs: MX

missiles, new submarines--eight of which have already been launched--Trident missiles; the invisible bomber known as the stealth, is also being manufactured as is a mobile nuclear base equipped with nuclear warheads, and cruise missiles installed in bombers.

This is all difficult to put in figures. According to the calculations of our experts if all these programs are carried out within a period of between 5 and 6 years then the United States will roughly treble its nuclear potential. Naturally, the Soviet Union cannot just look idly at these decisions by the White House. We shall take the relevant steps. Naturally we understand that one of the chief tasks Reagan and those around him--which means the military-industrial complex--have set themselves is to destroy us economically. But we have survived much more difficult periods. We survived the civil war, the intervention of 14 states; we survived Napoleon--that was even earlier--we survived Hitler's invasion. The Soviet people are patriots, people who are willing to sacrifice everything for their motherland. But we will never allow anyone to talk to us from a position of strength and this is precisely what the United States is striving to achieve. And we will never sacrifice the honor of our motherland, the honor of our people, the interests of our allies, including Czechoslovakia, which although a very small country is very close, very interesting, and dear to us. This is why we do not want to take up this new challenge; we would be reluctant to do so but we are compelled to take it up and so we will take it up. But it is difficult to say how the events will develop further because, as you yourselves know, there is very strong opposition in the United States itself, in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, and this opposition is especially strong in Europe. When the United States made this decision it totally scorned the interests of its allies in Europe.

A conference of NATO foreign ministers took place in Halifax, Canada recently where the West European allies of the United States expressed themselves very precisely and unequivocally against this decision. This is why we think and would like to hope that Reagan's decision is not final. We would want them to make a different decision; we want to preserve SALT II since it is one of the factors that acts as a brake on the arms race. But if SALT II ceases to be effective it is very difficult to imagine what will happen next, how events will develop further. And moreover, there is the SDI, Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, his star wars program. Mankind will find itself in a horrific situation, on the brink of a thermonuclear world war. We believe this should not be so. You know, the situation in history has always been like this: Two forces, two opposite tendencies, reason and unreason, have always fought against each other. At some stages unreason triumphed--let us recall Hitlerite fascism--but in the end reason has always prevailed over unreason and we believe that in this instance, too, mankind will not allow itself to be destroyed. It will find the means to ensure that our civilization is preserved and elevated to a new level.

After all, we have a number of earthly problems, including in our country, the Soviet Union, and obviously also in your country, Czechoslovakia; and we do not talk about the third world, which is drowning in multibillion



debts; we do not talk about hunger, ecological problems, the food problem. There exists a whole number of problems which require money and resources, and we believe that in the end mankind will find ways of using these resources on itself, on people, on raising their living standards and culture, and thus on raising the level of our civilization. Using resources on destructive means of waging wars is senseless; it is madness.

Let's take, for example, our accident at Chernobyl. It showed once again how treacherous and dangerous the atom is. And this is an atom used for peaceful purposes; this is a power plant used for peaceful purposes. And yet how much grief it has caused; how much grief there is still today. And at the same time we do not yet know all the consequences, because mankind encountered such a thing for the first time, eye to eye. And let us imagine if a single 300 kiloton nuclear bomb was exploded, which is 10 times more powerful than the one which exploded in Hiroshima. What would happen to mankind? This is horrible, something one can hardly imagine. And this is why we believe that it is essential to do the utmost to put an end to the arms race and then to destroy nuclear weapons totally.

We have a program. This program was explained by Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of our party in his statement of 15 January. It is a simple, attainable, and realistic program which can rid mankind of nuclear weapons in the course of, say, 15 years. Do you know what will be when enormous resources worth billions are invested in man and for man. It is precisely what we are thinking about and fighting for, and I believe that our Czechoslovak friends also desire the same.

[Question] I think that besides internal issues concerning the CEMA-- economic, scientific, cultural, and others--the meeting will also discuss international issues, problems concerning international security, averting thermonuclear war. I think that the summit will discuss new peace initiatives. There is, for instance, a very lively discussion going on in Europe about one of our latest proposals put forward by Comrade Gorbachev in Berlin at the SED Congress. It concerns a limitation, on a grand scale, of conventional arms in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. Apparently this issue will also be on the agenda at the meeting. The issue concerning the Reagan administration's plan to relinquish its obligation in connection with SALT II will also apparently be discussed. The agenda is not known to me. I am saying this merely on the basis of my knowledge of our policy, of my knowledge of the general secretary of our party's Central Committee, and of the leading officials of the socialist countries. I believe that very important issues concerning relations between our countries within the CEMA will be tackled with a view to strengthening and developing these relations even more. Issues of a global character will also be discussed.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1546



SALT/START ISSUES

TASS CHARGES 'MANIPULATION' OF HARRIS POLL ON SALT

LD232056 Moscow TASS in English 2009 GMT 23 Aug 86

[Text] Washington August 23 TASS -- TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev reports:

The more atrocious a lie the more believable it is is the old principle which seems to have been used by the Committee on the Present Danger to cook up its "sensational discovery."

What was the news for the sake of which a special press conference was called at the National Press Club? The leaders of that reactionary organization, manipulating "hard facts" obtained from a public opinion poll conducted at their request, claimed that 70 percent of the Americans approved President Reagan's decision to violate the basic stipulations of the SALT-2 treaty.

In other words, according to the committee, most of the U.S. population want ever new rounds of the nuclear arms race -- because the SALT-2 treaty and the SALT-1 interim accord have served for over ten years as a real obstacle to the quantitative buildup of the strategic arms arsenals.

Are these claims truly in accord with the sentiments and aspirations of the American people? No they are not, Donna Cartelli, a spokesman for the authoritative Harris service, told TASS correspondent. According to the public opinion polls conducted by her company, she said, the picture is very different.

As many as 72 percent of the Americans polled by the Harris service in the middle of June said that now that the U.S. and the USSR had enough nuclear weapons "to blow up each other", it was important to preserve any earlier accord helping nuclear arms control. About one half of the polled Americans voiced their worry about the consequences of the administration's decision to renounce the SALT-2 treaty.

Similar figures were produced by another poll, conducted by the ABC TV company jointly with THE WASHINGTON POST in the same month. Two out of every three respondents wanted continued compliance with the stipulations of the SALT-2 Accord. These sentiments, widespread among different sections of the American population, are manifest in an amendment approved by the House of Representatives last week, which blocked funds for the deployment of nuclear armaments over and above the SALT-2 limits.

All this clearly angers the administration and its rightwing backers and friends. They would like the American public to have a very different attitude. That was why the Committee on the Present Danger manipulated the results of the poll. The committee's chairman Charles Taylor said at the press conference that the results of the study were a warning to those on the Capital Hill who had voted for compliance with the SALT-2 accord. In other words, the committee decided to tell the law makers to toe the White House line.

Small wonder that this "warning", sounding rather like a threat, came from the Committee on the Present Danger: It includes such figures as the current director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Kenneth Adelman, Paul Nitze, adviser to the President and secretary of state on arms reduction talks, Max Kampelman, the chief American negotiator at the talks on nuclear and space weapons. This "poll", therefore, obviously belies the hand of the Reagan administration, which seems not to have given up the hope to push back the public mood in the USA into the darkest years of the cold war.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1546

## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

### PRAVDA CRITICIZES NATO ATTEMPTS TO JUSTIFY MISSILE DEPLOYMENTS

PM201456 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Aug 86 Second Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondent Yu. Kharlanov: "Avoiding Answering. Conversation With NATO Headquarters on Nuclear Missiles in Europe"]

[Text] Brussels, Aug--At the height of the summer vacation I had to wait rather a long time for the NATO switchboard operator to find someone able to talk with me. It was NATO Brussels political headquarters press service employee (Sveysen). I had one question: What has NATO to say about the reminder in M.S. Gorbachev's Vladivostok speech that the Soviet Union is proposing the elimination of both U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe. Yes, eliminate, not transfer them somewhere else.

The response was a prolonged silence. I had to translate the sentence from M.S. Gorbachev's speech again. Then my interlocutor said very politely: "I'm sorry, you have the wrong place."

"What do you mean the wrong place?"

"The talks on medium-range nuclear missiles are being held in Geneva between the Soviet and U.S. delegations."

"But you can have your own opinion, can't you?"

"Yes, yes, we are well informed. The U.S. delegates in Geneva regularly report to the U.S. allies on the course of the talks there within the framework of the NATO Special Consultative Group that regularly meets in Brussels. As recently as 24 July U.S. spokesman in Geneva (M. Glitman) gave a detailed account at a group session of what was happening in Geneva and of the prospects for the future."

"As a NATO-accredited journalist, you must have the communique for the press on the meeting."

There the conversation ended. I took out the communique he had mentioned and confirmed that, in fact, it expressed one idea: The NATO Special Consultative Group participants express their support for the U.S. stance in Geneva.

How many times at press conferences and briefings after sessions of NATO military committees and the Special Consultative Group have journalists heard the argument that Soviet SS-20's are mobile missiles and that they can easily be transferred to Siberia and back again. And that therefore in no way can the Russians be trusted. NATO headquarters produced the thesis that the withdrawal of U.S. medium-range missiles is undesirable because the Soviets would then keep the advantage in the conventional arms sphere.

Now both the first and second arguments have come to grief. (As for conventional armaments in Europe, the Warsaw Pact countries have put forward a program for their reduction that totally repudiates the thesis of the "imbalance" which, they say, needs to be countered with the aid of U.S. missiles).

Speaking in Brussels, NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington put forward a highly original idea. You see, Carrington said, the fewer missiles and warheads there are in the world, the more difficult it will be to control them. Given the present correlation of forces, he said, if someone hides two missiles in a haystack, it is of no great significance from the military viewpoint. But what would happen if the two missiles in the haystack were the last remaining missiles in a nuclear-free world? the NATO secretary general asked.

One can only marvel at the absurd lengths NATO goes to in an effort to justify the Washington-imposed nuclear missiles race and prevent even the very first steps on the path to curbing it!

/7358

CSO: 5200/1545

USSR'S GERASIMOV: U.S. MAY BLOCK CD AGREEMENT TO BAN CW

LD221401 Moscow TASS in English 1349 GMT 22 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 22 TASS -- Certain actions by the United States may block the work at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva on drafting a convention banning chemical weapons, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, told a news conference here today.

He recalled that President Ronald Reagan told Congress on July 29 that the U.S. could start the production of chemical binary munitions.

On August 16, the President in his radio address asked the House of Representatives to review its decision on quotas on the funds to produce binary munitions.

Simultaneously, Washington claimed that seven laboratories developing bacteriological weapons were operating in the Soviet Union. The U.S. Defence Department accused the USSR of manufacturing such weapons. These allegations, said the Soviet spokesman, were false from beginning to end.

Their aim was to divert attention from preparations for bacteriological weapons production in the United States, Gerasimov added.

The USSR unlike the United States, joined the 1925 Geneva protocol, and voted in 1981 in favour of the resolution of the first committee of the U.N. General Assembly on the prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons, which called upon nations to refrain from producing and deploying new types of weapons of mass annihilation.

157 Countries voted for the resolution, and only one country, the United States, voted against.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1544

JPRS-TAC-86-075  
18 September 1986

## CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

### SOVIET COMMENTATOR ON SENATE VOTE ON BINARY WEAPONS

PM261014 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 19 Aug 86 p 3

[Vadim Biryukov "Commentator's Opinion": "'Big Eye' for Europe"]

[Text] The U.S. Senate has voted 57 to 43 against a legislative amendment stipulating that NATO countries agreement be obtained before beginning the production of a new type of chemical weapons, namely binary munitions. At the same time, an amendment to cancel appropriations for the production of the 'Big Eye' chemical binary bomb in the budget for fiscal 1986 was rejected 51 votes to 50.

Before the vote, thanks to which the decision to allocate funds for the production of chemical weapons was "pushed" through the Senate, the White House hurriedly dispatched U.S. Vice President George Bush to Capitol Hill. Under the U.S. Constitution, he is formally the president of the Senate. His vote proved decisive.

The voting in the Senate, where the Republicans have the majority, has graphically demonstrated that Washington does not intend to delay the implementation of its dangerous plans for the "chemical rearmament" of the United States, disregarding even the stance of the House of Representatives, which has voted against the production of chemical weapons. And -- most important -- that it has no intention of consulting its closest NATO allies on this question.

It is known that the NATO countries defense ministers merely "took note" of the U.S. plans, which certainly does not mean that they agreed to the stationing of the new generation of chemical weapons on their territories.

It seems that Washington has already made up its mind that the "Big Eye" bombs will be deployed in Europe. From the U.S. strategists' viewpoint this is absolutely logical -- storing chemical weapons as far away as possible from their own borders and as close as possible to the envisaged "theater of military operations" -- a role which the United States so kindly assigned to the Old World. However, the population of Europe takes a different view. It protests the plans of the U.S. military to transform the continent into a U.S. chemical weapons dump and does not want to become the hostage of Washington's aggressive policy.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1544

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

AFGHAN CAPTIVE ALLEGES U.S. USE OF CHEMICAL ARMS

AU191018 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 16 Aug 86 p 7

[Unattributed article: "Afghan Bandits Are Testing American Chemical Weapons; Testimony of an Apprehended Counterrevolutionary; the Weapons and Fabrications that are Being Spread Have an Identical Country of Origin -- the United States"]

[Text] Counterrevolutionaries from the gang commanded by "Captain Ismail" recently shelled with chemical mines the kishlak (village) of (Caste-Sarif) in the Afghan Province of Herat. The kishlak self-defense unit later apprehended a group of persons nearby who were photographing the attacked area, taking samples of soil and water, and speaking to eyewitnesses of the attack.

B. Gan, APN reporter in Afghanistan, met one man from the group apprehended in the vicinity of the (Caste-Sarif) kishlak, who was held in custody for questioning by the Ministry for State Security of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan [DRA]. The 30-year old (Rachim Madzid) used to study chemistry at the Natural Sciences Department of Kabul University, and several years ago -- under the influence of hostile propaganda -- he dropped out and went to Pakistan. There he came to the (Varsak) camp near Peshavar. He related the following to the APN reporter:

"In the camp American instructors taught me to survey a location after it had been attacked with chemical weapons, to take samples, and record conversations with eyewitnesses and victims. I carried out similar tasks on Afghan territory about twenty times."

"How was the locality for an attack determined?"

"Before we were to proceed they gave us the name of the locality and its location. That means that the camp leadership knew the place of the next chemical attack beforehand. Our task was to bring the commanders a full description of the consequences of the attack and deliver to Pakistan 'material evidence' that the Soviet and the Afghan armies use chemical weapons in the DRA."

"The cases described by Madzid is not the only one," says (Gulam Nabi), a major in the Afghan Army. The APN reporter made his acquaintance at an exhibition of captured weapons. Exhibited here are machine guns, submachine guns, mines, recoilless weapons, light field-guns, ground-to-ground and ground-to-air rockets, antiaircraft weapons made in the West. Chemical ammunition is a separate part of the exhibition.

"The first American mines and grenades filled with the poisonous substance CS already came into our hands in 1981," Nabi says. "And since then one has apprehended a quantity of similar ammunition. This one is the latest one."

Nabi shows grenades marked U.S. Army S-S-M-P 7. They were seized when fighting gangs in the provinces of Paktia and Herat.

"What chemical weapons does the counterrevolution use?" the APN reporter asked Nabi.

"For a long time now the bandits have not risked as direct encounter with the Afghan Army. Their only method of 'combat activity' is terror and diversion. They are shelling faraway kishlaks with ammunition and mines filled with poisonous substances, places where they know there are neither Afghan nor Soviet military detachments. Peaceful farmers are the victims of chemical weapons.

"And then they release into the world various legends and fairy tales about 'chemical warfares, waged by the USSR against the DRA's civilian populace.' These fabrications, like the weapons they put in the hands of bandits, carry the identical brand: Made in the U.S.A."

/7358

CSO: 5200/1544



EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

JPRS-TAC-86-075  
18 September 1986

SOVIET ARMY PAPER ACCUSES WEST OF 'UNCONSTRUCTIVE' MBFR STANCE

PM261156 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Aug 86 First Edition p 3

[Article by Colonel S. Vilkov and Lieutenant Colonel Yu. Borin: "Vienna" What Is Holding Up the Talks?"]

[Text] At the Budapest conference of the Political Consultative Committee the Warsaw Pact states once again put to the NATO states and to all European countries detailed proposals for the reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. "In this sphere, too, we want progress -- joint and consistent progress -- toward lower and less dangerous levels of military confrontation," M.S. Gorbachev emphasized in his statement on Soviet television.

Those proposals constitute a weighty addition to the program advanced by the Soviet Union for the total elimination of nuclear and other kinds of weapons of mass destruction from the planet by the year 2000 and, at the same time, are of an independent nature. They make it possible to remove from the agenda the question posed by some people to the effect that the elimination of nuclear weapons from the continent will supposedly upset the equilibrium in favor of the socialist countries, which allegedly have superiority in terms of conventional weapons.

However, this problem is only being examined at the talks in Vienna. Moreover, it is being discussed there only in relation to a narrow region -- central Europe.

These talks have been going on for many years. But, so far, essentially no real results have been achieved. There is still no consensus even regarding to the material substance of the proposed agreement. This is not the socialist countries' fault. Contrary to the mandate of the Vienna talks adopted by the states of the North Atlantic alliance and the Warsaw Pact in 1973, the NATO countries are stubbornly striving to reduce the issues being examined in Vienna to a reduction and subsequent nonincrease in the number of troop personnel alone. They are deliberately leaving to one side the problem of reducing and limiting arms.

The arms buildup and talks on arms reduction are incompatible things. Nevertheless, the number of conventional arms in West European countries, including those participating in the Vienna talks, continues to grow year by year. According to a decision adopted by the NATO bloc's leading organs in December 1985, the West European member-countries of the Eurogroup alone will this year receive a sum total of 900 new tanks and armored cars, a large proportion of which will be Leopard 2 and Challenger tanks; 100 heavy field guns; 250 combat aircraft, including 180 of the Tornado and F-16 type; 1 aircraft carrier; 3 submarines; and a lot of other combat hardware. And as for

U.S. troops and arms, with which it was proposed to begin the reductions within NATO, in 1987 it is planned not to reduce but, just the opposite, to increase the American Armed Forces. It is proposed to equip them with an additional 840 M1 Abrams tanks, 870 bradley infantry fighting vehicles, and more than 400 combat aircraft. Much of this will enter the arsenal of the American troops stationed in Europe.

All this is being done after the Warsaw Pact states submitted for consideration by the Vienna talks, on 20 February 1986, a draft agreement on an initial Soviet and U.S. reduction of ground forces and arms with a subsequent nonincrease in the levels of the sides' armed forces and arms and on associated measures in central Europe. First, that document developed, elaborated on, and added to the provisions of the Soviet proposal advanced in February 1985. Second, it took into account those elements in the position of the Western participants in the talks that seem acceptable. Third, it proposed compromise solutions to a number of important questions on which the disagreements between the sides are most profound. That draft agreement provides a realistic basis for achieving positive results in Vienna.

However, the Western countries, while apparently agreeing to the proposed scheme for reducing Soviet and American troops and to the subsequent nonincrease in the levels of armed forces and arms, have at the same time filled it with substance that generally calls in question the possibility of reaching an accord at the Vienna talks. The deliberately substitute farfetched questions of monitoring [kontrol] and verifying [proverka] an agreement that does not yet exist for the resolution of the urgent task of ending and limiting the conventional arms race and lowering the level of military confrontation. At the same time, the NATO representatives at the talks very freely manipulate the concept of monitoring [kontrol], divorcing it from the essence of the proposed draft document. They deliberately take monitoring [kontrol] measures to unrealistic and even absurd lengths, which are known to be unacceptable to the other side and lead to the unjustified disclosure of the socialist states' entire defense structure (right down to indicating the location of every battalion and individual barracks) and to serious interference in their internal affairs. Thus, whereas the proposal advanced by the West in April 1984 provided for a reduction in American and Soviet troops by 13,000 and 30,000 men respectively, for which it was proposed to conduct 18 on-site inspections [inspektsii] annually, the proposal advanced in December 1985 reduced the volumes of troops reductions to 5,000 and 11,500 men, while at the same time almost doubling the number of inspections [inspektsii]. One wonders: Is there any logic here at all?

There are also other aspects of the Western proposals that suggest that the United States and its NATO allies are seeking to achieve just one aim at the Vienna talks -- to bring under their control the entire military activity of the Warsaw Pact states' armed forces. Do the West's demand relating to extending verification [proverka] measures beyond the region of the reductions, including to a number of western military districts of the Soviet Union, really meet the requirement for the sides' commitments to be of equal value? All this is being done on the pretext that this territory "adjoins the region of reductions."

But why not, in that case, extend these measures also to the territory of all the NATO countries adjacent to the region of reduction? If you look at the situation from a strategic point of view, the question of U.S. territory also arises.

But, of course, the West's demands, which have been taken to manifestly absurd lengths, cannot fail to hold up the reaching of accords at the Vienna talks.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries propose very simple and perfectly effective verification [kontrol] and inspection [proverka] measures as the way out of the impasse created by the NATO countries. These measures include, in particular, national technical means of verification [kontrol], the exchange of lists of the units being reduced and withdrawn, mutual notification about the beginning and end of reductions, and the setting up by each side of several permanently operating centers to monitor [kontrol] the withdrawal of the troops being reduced. In addition, the socialist countries also propose other measures to monitor the future agreement.

The realistic proposals advanced by the socialist countries eloquently demonstrates who is really full of goodwill to erect a reliable barrier in the way of the race for conventional arms and armed forces in Europe for the first time since World War II, and who is stubbornly holding up this important process that is vitally necessary to all people. "Certain American politicians," M.S. Gorbachev said in his 18 August statement, "interpret the fact that we are participating in the talks as a result of the growth of U.S. military might and the elaboration of the SDI program. Building its policy on such false premises, the American Administration can in no way emerge onto the road of honest agreements and of improving the international climate. And yet, the realities of life will have to be reckoned with. There is no getting away from them."

If they really -- not verbally but actually -- advocate the relaxation of international tension and the strengthening of security in Europe, the United States and the other NATO countries must reconsider their ambitious and unconstructive stance with regard to reducing and limiting arms and to certain measures of verification [kontrol]. It is necessary, finally, to overcome the extremely dangerous trend toward the continues buildup of troops and arms, to renounce pretensions to securing military advantages under cover of the Vienna talks, and to be guided by the principle of equality and identical security.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1543

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR MILITARY JOURNAL ON WARSAW PACT AS SHIELD AGAINST AGGRESSION

Moscow AVIATSIYA I KOSMONAVTIKA in Russian No 5, May 86 (signed to press 2 Apr 86) pp 30-31

[Article, published under the heading "At the Fronts of the Ideological Struggle," by Maj V. Ovsyannikov: "Truth Against Lies"]

[Text] The "psychological warfare" unleashed by imperialism cannot be called anything other than a special form of aggression and informational imperialism, trampling the sovereignty, history, and culture of peoples. It also constitutes outright political-psychological preparation for war, which naturally has nothing in common either with a genuine comparing of views or with the free exchange of ideas, which is so hypocritically claimed in the West. Nor is there any other way to assess actions whereby people are taught to look through a gunsight at any society which is not to the liking of imperialism.

From the CPSU Central Committee  
Political Report to the 27th CPSU  
Congress of the Communist Party of  
the Soviet Union

An event took place 31 years ago, on 14 May 1955, which was of exceptional significance for the fraternal peoples of the socialist countries: an historic document of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance was signed in Warsaw -- the Warsaw Pact.

"History has never known a community of nations in which nobody possesses or could possess special rights and privileges, in which international relations have truly been transformed into relations between peoples, in which fruitful ties have been established and are developing at various levels -- from the highest level of party and government leadership to workforces," states the CPSU Program about the Council for Economic Mutual Assistance and the Warsaw Pact Organization. "Partnership multiplies the resources of the brother nations in building socialism and helps reliably guarantee their security."

Progressive peace-loving forces throughout the world greeted the establishment in Europe of a reliable bulwark of peace and security. In the camp of imperialist reaction, however, news of this was met with vicious attacks against the military-political alliance of the nations of the socialist community.

U.S. imperialism's shift to an undisguised policy of "neoglobalism" has resulted in the mid-1980's in intensification of brazen, no-holds-barred slander against the Warsaw Pact. A murky flow of bourgeois lies has inundated Western readers with the blessing of the current U.S. President, who stated outright that the Communists are hindering the Americans from carving up the world once and for all and therefore the United States should do everything it can to leave Marxism-Leninism on the ash heap of history. With their characteristic contempt for obvious facts, the ideological flunkies of imperialism, piling one lie upon another, attempt to present in a distorted manner to readers, TV viewers and radio listeners the aims and nature of the Warsaw Pact. Proceeding from prejudiced geopolitical conclusions, they attempt first of all to display the Warsaw Pact Organization as an "instrument of aggression." In particular, the air forces of the socialist armed forces are portrayed in books by Western authors as an "omnipresent specter" threatening the NATO countries.

In order better to understand the scientific bankruptcy and reactionary nature of bourgeois lies about the "aggressiveness" of the Warsaw Pact, let us return to the events which served as the reason for consolidation of the European socialist countries into a military-political alliance.

Creation of the Warsaw Pact was a response measure by the brother socialist nations to a dangerous policy shift by the Western powers, which had broken with the aims and principles of the anti-Hitler coalition. As a result of establishment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in 1949 and an entire system of aggressive blocs, as well as remilitarization of the FRG and acceptance of that country to NATO membership, there developed a genuine threat of another war in Europe. In these conditions there arose the need for constructive solutions and practical actions guaranteeing the security of the socialist countries. In particular, there was a need to supplement the bilateral treaties of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance between individual socialist countries with a multilateral treaty. Creation of the Warsaw Pact proceeded from the objective requirements of unification of the efforts of the socialist nations in the area of foreign policy and defense and was dictated by their national and international interests. "Capital is an international force," stated V. I. Lenin. "An international alliance and fraternity of workers is needed in order to defeat it."

The Warsaw Pact Organization was a defensive alliance from the very outset. The Treaty states that the participating countries will take "coordinated measures necessary to strengthen their defense capability, in order to protect the peaceful labor of their peoples, to guarantee the inviolability of their borders and territories, and to provide defense against potential aggression." In contrast to the imperialist blocs, the Warsaw Pact is not a narrow, exclusive military organization but is open to membership by other nations which express the desire to fight for peace and international security.

The peace-loving nature of the Warsaw Pact proceeds from its genuinely popular character. The very nature of socialism, grounded on public ownership of the means of production, confirms peace without weapons as its ideal.

In contrast to this, the flywheel of preparations for war is spinning up to an unprecedented velocity in the capitalist countries. Nor is it surprising that it is primarily the U.S. monopolies which violently oppose agreements between the USSR and the United States on reducing nuclear and conventional arms. Since 1980 the profits of the major U.S. arms magnates have tripled on the average. The net profits of just the aerospace companies totaled 1.4 billion dollars for the first 9 months of last year. Termination of or even cutbacks in arms production programs would sharply diminish revenues for the monopolists.

The resolutions of the Conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact Member Nations, held in Sofia in October 1985, constituted an important event in the struggle by peace-loving forces throughout the world to end the arms race and achieve disarmament. In the declaration "Eliminating the Nuclear Threat and Taking a Turn for the Better in European and World Affairs" adopted at the conference, the leaders of the allied socialist nations, in addition to advancing new specific proposals, once again declared their readiness and willingness immediately to dissolve the Warsaw Pact with simultaneous dissolution of the NATO Pact, and to dissolve their military organizations as a first step.

In response to this, forces in the West proceeded with an intensive effort at dissemination of various myths presenting the USSR and its allies in a sinister form and utilizing as proof the "concealed meaning" of their peace-seeking proposals. One of these myths was dubbed the theory of "Finlandization." Its authors claim that if NATO is dissolved and U.S. troops are withdrawn from the European continent, the balance of forces will decisively shift in favor of the USSR, which the Soviet Union will allegedly be able to take advantage of to "seize" or "revolutionize" Western Europe. According to their fanciful conjectures, the USSR will consider the use of force unnecessary and will proceed to use its military might as a political instrument. As a result the Western nations will find themselves in a so-called "Finnish situation": they will be drawn into the "Soviet sphere of influence" without military occupation or "Sovietization." In the opinion of bourgeois authors, the countries of Western Europe are incapable of putting up anything in opposition to political pressure supported by military power due to their... "poor state of armament."

The participants in the Sofia Conference of the Political Consultative Committee spoke out resolutely in favor of stopping the further deployment of nuclear weapons on the continent and accomplishing a reduction in nuclear arms. They affirmed their resolve to seek the total elimination of nuclear weapons from Europe. But bourgeois ideologues also see a "false bottom" in this proposal as well. Here is an example of such an "exposure." It seems that the European socialist community opposes nuclear war not because it threatens human civilization but, in the opinion of one Western "researcher," because in view of the "superiority in conventional arms, in a nonnuclear

conflict between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, the latter has an indisputable capability to win." These bourgeois falsifiers, however, deliberately fail to mention that the Warsaw Pact nations seek to unleash neither a nuclear nor a nonnuclear conflict.

Obviously these pseudoscientific phony claims have nothing in common with reality. With the help of such claims the ideologues of imperialism attempt to distort the essence of peace initiatives by the brother socialist countries, to compromise the foreign policy of the Soviet State, and consequently to broaden artificially among the people of the West a social base of support for NATO armament programs.

Utilizing such an ideological cover, NATO leaders are pursuing a course of policy aimed at expanding the process of military preparations by the NATO member countries. This finds expression in a steady growth in their military expenditures, which have increased by a factor of 1.5 just in the last 5 years. According to official estimates by foreign experts, actual military expenditures by the European NATO countries reached 350 billion dollars in 1985. NATO authorities devote particular attention to increasing air power. Last year alone the air forces of the European NATO nations took delivery on more than 300 aircraft, including approximately 280 Tornado and F-16 tactical fighters, which are capable of carrying both conventional and nuclear weapons.

The military-political leaders of the fraternal alliance of socialist countries cannot ignore the fact that NATO proposed new aggressive doctrines and is building up nuclear and conventional arms at an accelerated pace, and are compelled to take response measures. As long as the imperialist NATO bloc continues to exist, it was noted at the 27th CPSU Congress, the party considers it essential to make every effort to help improve the activities of the Warsaw Pact Organization as an instrument of collective defense against the aggressive aspirations of imperialism and of a joint struggle for a firm peace and expanded international cooperation.

The imperialist bourgeoisie, in devising plans to crush socialism, prefers to deal not with a united front but with separate, disunited socialist countries. For this reason falsification of the nature of interrelationships within the military-political alliance of nations of the socialist community and the Soviet Union's role in that alliance has become one of the directional thrusts of subversive anticommunist strategy. Some "Sovietologists" claim that the USSR is using its military might to control the armed forces of its allies and thus is limiting their political role, while other "scholars" portray the Armed Forces as a "key stabilizing factor in Eastern Europe." In recent years attacks against the Warsaw Pact Organization have become more sophisticated. A theory of so-called "political reliability of socialist armies" appeared fairly recently in the Western press, a theory which boils down essentially to the authors' elaboration of "criteria of reliability" of the armed forces of the socialist nations in different variations of war with the NATO bloc as well as... with the Soviet Union.

What aim do the Western authors pursue? Ideological sabotage (and such deliberations cannot be called anything else) against the military-political cooperation of the socialist countries is directed first and foremost at



undermining the foundations of their unity, at weakening their military might, and at transforming, as is noted in a NATO document, the Warsaw Pact "into an easily-broken tool." It is therefore not mere happenstance that anti-communists, in their endeavor to split the unity of the socialist countries, count heavily on creating an atmosphere of suspiciousness in relations between the brother armies and at isolating them and setting them against one another. It is clearly evident in the example of the above-cited "theory" however, how contrived and antiscientific all these phony claims and concepts are, the purpose of which is essentially to play on the nationalistic prejudices and a false notion of "national sovereignty." The ideologues of anticommunism deliberately make no mention of the community of root class interests of our countries and the most important component part of their national, governmental interests — a military-political alliance with the USSR as a guarantee of preserving socialist achievements in these countries.

Within the framework of the combat alliance, the USSR Armed Forces are *primus inter pares*. The sole possessors of nuclear weapons within the Warsaw Pact, they continue to remain the principal factor in defending peace and in holding imperialist aggression in check. And this not only does not detract from the role of the brother armies as a factor of peace but, on the contrary, gives them greater confidence in their capabilities.

Relations among the countries of the NATO bloc stand out in sharp contrast. No matter how loudly "Atlantic solidarity" is proclaimed, the apologists of capitalism are unable to ignore the acute conflicts between the members of the North Atlantic Pact caused by capitalist competition. Even "duty of alliance" does not hold back the U.S. monopolists from the temptation to extract profit from supplying military hardware to their partners. Here is a typical example. In 1975 Norway, Denmark, Belgium, and the Netherlands, in conformity with NATO plans, decided to upgrade their fleet of military aircraft. The U.S. company General Dynamics was awarded the contract following fierce competition with companies from other countries. Norway, for example, ordered 72 F-16 fighters at a total cost of 2.9 billion kroner. By 1979, however, the initial price per aircraft had increased sharply, and 4 billion kroner were paid for the ordered aircraft. This "deal of the century" worked out exactly the same for Denmark.

The brother parties soberly assess the danger lying hidden behind the hypocritical imperialist "concern" for their national interests. They resolutely resist any and all attempts to set these interests against the common responsibility of communists for the fate at world socialism and internationalist duty to the working people of the other socialist countries.

The entirety of postwar history attests to the fact that the Warsaw Pact is an alliance of equal socialist states, serving as a powerful barrier against which aggressive imperialist intrigues have shattered and will shatter in the future. The alliance is marking its 31st anniversary as an effective instrument of peace and security of peoples. The men of the Air Force, who are totally dedicated to their patriotic and internationalist duty, in implementing the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress are strengthening in every possible way the fighting alliance with the airmen of the armies of the socialist nations, standing wing to wing with their class brothers, their brothers in arms, reliably guarding the skies of the homeland and the nations of the socialist community.

COPYRIGHT: "Aviatsiya i kosmonavtika", 1986.'



USSR: LATE AUGUST REPORTS, COMMENTS ON CDE

Gen Tatarnikov Interviewed

AU221341 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 21 Aug 86 p 6

[Interview with Major General Viktor Tatarnikov, member of the Soviet delegation at the Stockholm conference, by Colonel V. Morozov, APN military commentator: "Stockholm: Approaching the Last Stretch"--date, place not given; opening paragraph is paper's introduction]

[Text] The Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures, Security, and Disarmament in Europe is entering its most responsible phase--the phase of concluding its first stage and drawing up a final document.

Colonel V. Morozov, APN military commentator, has met with Major General Viktor Tatarnikov, member of the Soviet delegation at the Stockholm conference, to ask him for answers to some questions connected with the results of the first stage of that conference.

[Morozov] The Stockholm conference, which is now approaching its last stretch, has obtained new and fresh stimuli that bring it straight to the attainment of positive results regarding the promotion of confidence and security in Europe. What must be done to safeguard the success of Stockholm?

[Tatarnikov] As has been declared by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the time has come for all participants in the conference to display responsibility and flexibility. Only responsible mutual concessions based on the principle of equality and equal security can result in a positive outcome.

As is known, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have taken a number of steps to achieve specific results regarding the key issues of the conference. These include notification of upcoming military exercises, exchange of annual plans of military activities, invitation of observers, limitation of the scope of military exercises, nonuse of force, verification, and so forth. There was not a single session in the course of the entire last year without one of the socialist countries -- Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, Romania, or the USSR -- coming up with a proposal that forwarded the work of the conference. The work of the Stockholm conference to result in generally acceptable agreements, the socialist countries are ready to continue to work in a constructive spirit and to seek the balanced solution of all questions by means of compromise.

The endeavor exerted by neutral and nonaligned countries to achieve progress at the conference must also be appreciated. The recent pronouncement by the representative of Canada, who put forward the proposals of Western countries, too, can be regarded as a political signal of the readiness to move ahead.

[Morozov] The conference has made notable headway recently. It has managed, above all, to unravel one of the entangled knots that for a very long time stood in the way of any forward movement -- the question of advance information on air force exercises. Could you expound this question in greater detail?

[Tatarnikov] The socialist countries do not employ words but deeds to demonstrate their constructive approach to the working out of confidence-building measures. Regrettably, the NATO countries absolutely refused to announce their air force exercises. There was a long and sharp struggle at the conference between these two poles in the positions of the two sides.

A compromise has been found on the basis of the determination of the lower limit [poduroven] of air force activity within the framework of notifications of exercises of ground forces, going on from which it would be necessary to supply some important data on air force exercises. I must say straight away that all participants in the negotiations contributed to the attainment of this compromise by manifesting their political will to reach an agreement. As has been declared by the representative of Poland, in the event of such a solution the socialist countries are willing to accept the transfer of the question of the notification of individual air force exercises to [as published] the present stage of the conference, as has already been done regarding naval activity.

Now it is necessary to discuss this lower limit for the air force. Many countries -- neutral countries as well as NATO member-countries -- have repeatedly advocated a lower ceiling, which would provide more information on air force exercises.

We have considered their reasons and propose that the air parameter [letecky parameter] be 200 take-offs during the entire exercise. We are convinced that our partners will accept this proposal.

[Morozov] What agreements have already been reached at the conference concerning exercises of land troops?

[Tatarnikov] With regard to exercises of land troops, a common ground is already on the horizon. We have agreed that notifications should concern exercises of land troops carried out together with air force and naval formations, amphibious and airborne troops. Now it is only necessary to agree on the parameters of these notifications.

As is known, the socialist countries have already taken a step to accommodate the wish of many countries -- not only NATO members but also neutral countries -- by accepting reduction of the notification limit to 18,000 men. But the Soviet side is convinced that if negotiations on this topic also get into the current of generally acceptable agreements, the limit of 18,000 does not have to be the last word. We could further reduce this level, self-evidently on the basis of reciprocity. In doing so, we must remember that the parameter for notifications of exercises of land troops must be acceptable to everyone and must not in the least reduce the level of security of any country.

If we find a generally acceptable numerical level for notification, we could then find a parameter for notification concerning land troops that would apply to all its aspects

[sentence as published]. Let us recall that three different approaches to the solution of the problem have been proposed at the conference. The first approach places emphasis on structure, the second on numbers, and the third on "mobility and firepower." As far as the USSR is concerned, its delegation is ready to work with the other delegations on the question of finding the best combination of these approaches.

[Morozov] The path toward confidence and security is also linked with measures of such importance as the notification of the movement of troops to the zone that is subject to the confidence-building and security-promoting measures. How is this question being dealt with?

[Tatarnikov] Such an agreement could serve as an impetus for progress on many other questions as well. It is important that the agreement rule out the possibility of the concealed amassing of troops, and, at the same time, that it provide for timely notification of the arrival of troops in Europe to carry out activities that will be subject to notification.

[Morozov] What is the possible significance, from the viewpoint of confidence-building measures, of an agreement on exchanges of individual states' annual plans of military activities?

[Tatarnikov] An agreement concerning the exchange of annual plans of military activities would become something of a safeguard against the implementation of hidden preparations for war. The socialist countries have exerted great efforts to achieve progress in discussing this confidence-building measure. The matter has gradually made headway. Considering the wishes of neutral, nonaligned, and Western countries, the socialist countries have proposed that the participating countries exchange such plans for each successive year, no later than by 15 or 20 November of the preceding year.

To find generally acceptable solution concerning confidence-limiting [as published] measures, solutions that would consider the security interests of all participating states, the socialist countries are ready to accept as a point of departure the proposals put forward by neutral and nonaligned countries.

These proposals provide many options. On one hand, there is for instance the proposal that not more than 5 announced military exercises be carried out in the course of a year in addition to the planned exercises, the scale of which would exceed 50 percent of the level that is subject to notification. On the other hand, there is the proposal that the number of such exercises not be limited if they are part of the annual plans of military activities. I am convinced that even given such heterogeneous approaches it is possible, and necessary, to find a generally acceptable agreement.

[Morozov] What is the nature of the agreement reached by the conference on the problem of verification?

[Tatarnikov] The problem of verification is of the utmost importance to the socialist countries. We want to have the certainty that the agreements we conclude will be strictly observed by everyone. That is why we want to succeed in having the agreements on confidence-building measures safeguarded by means of effective and adequate verification. On this question we are ready to go as far as will be required in the interest of the matter.

As is known, the proposals the Warsaw Pact member-countries recently tabled in Budapest contain the idea of verifying the implementation of confidence-building measures, including the idea of on-site inspection. The socialist countries are ready to

negotiate the problem of inspection and are convinced that on this issue it is also possible to move ahead. It is possible, above all, to conclude an agreement in which the participating states would undertake to carry out on-site inspection aimed at confidence-building measures in the process of verifying the reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons.

In conclusion I would like to stress that the only way to achieve an agreement of substance at the Stockholm conference is by means of mutual concessions. It is to be hoped that the initiatives of the socialist countries will give the appropriate dynamism to the work of the conference, a dynamism that will in the remaining weeks before the conclusion of the work of the conference on 19 September will lead to precisely such an agreement. Of course, this presupposes good-will on the part of all participants in the conference.

### Results Tied to 'Military Restrictions'

LD221410 Moscow Tass International Service in Russian 1211 GMT 22 Aug 86

[Text] Stockholm, 22 Aug (TASS) -- TASS special correspondents Vladimir Bogchev and Nikolay Vukolov report:

Of later certain positive moves have taken place at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures, Security and Disarmament in Europe [CDE]. These events have improved the atmosphere at the talks. At the same time a number of important problems, whose solution is being blocked by the United States and certain NATO allies, still remain to be settled at the forum.

In the working group dealing with measures to restrict military activity, the U.S. obstructionist position is impeding agreement on the question of establishing a ceiling on the levels of large military exercises, the numbers involved in them, and the length of such exercises. It is hard to exaggerate the importance of finding a positive solution to this problem in accordance with the conference's mandate to reduce the levels of military confrontation.

Postwar history is full of examples of occasions when NATO used military maneuvers to threaten and put pressure on independent states, whose policies were not to Washingtons liking. There is a real danger that preparations for a hot war could be screened by large-scale military exercises. Their present scale, scope and intensity makes it possible to effectively prepare for the infliction of a first strike. After all, NATO's troop formations and units, which take part in maneuvers, are as a rule equipped with their full range of ammunition, including nuclear munitions. Combat firings of missiles and bombing runs take place during exercises.

NATO's exercises code-named "Autumn Forge," which began a few days ago in Denmark, close to where the Stockholm conference is being held, are an example of such dangerous maneuvers. Up to 200,000 servicemen from the NATO countries, a thousand combat aircraft and warships will be involved in these maneuvers.

[Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1330 GMT on 22 August carries this report but rewords the preceding paragraph as follows:

[NATO's exercises code-named Autumn Forge, which began a few days ago over vast areas of Western Europe, including Denmark, which is Sweden's neighbor, in direct proximity

to the venue of the Stockholm conference, are an example of such dangerous maneuvers. Over 200,000 servicemen from the NATO countries and about a thousand combat aircraft and warships will be involved in these maneuvers."]

A positive decision on military maneuvers will decrease the likelihood of an incorrect evaluation of the actions of the other side, thereby lower the risk of war. The participants in the conference have already reached agreement in principle on the need to establish the level of military exercises about which the other sides must be informed.

Displaying flexibility and a constructive approach, the socialist countries, taking account of the wishes of the neutral and nonaligned states, put forward a proposal that military exercises not exceed more than five times the level before advance notification. This means, for example, that if the level of exercises before notification amounts to, say, 18,000 men, the sides must not carry out maneuvers involving more than 90,000 servicemen.

According to the proposal of the socialist countries, there should be a ban on conducting more than six military exercises in a calendar year, the scales of which exceed 2 or more times the level before notification. The USSR and many other states propose not to conduct exercises of amphibious and air assault troops in numbers in excess of 7,000 men. The Soviet Union has announced its readiness to constructively discuss other questions relating to the limitation of military activity.

In light of the common tasks facing the conference -- to ensure the creation of barriers on the path of the use of force and covert preparations for war -- grave concern is generated by the blatant reluctance of some NATO countries to try to reach a mutually acceptable agreement on restricting military activity, including on the scale of military exercises. The matter is held up by the fact that the Atlanticists are not submitting any specific proposals on the question in Stockholm and see the main task as retaining for themselves the right to an uncontrolled increase in military activity on the Europe Continent. The U.S. position is fraught with the danger of a sudden destabilization of the military-political situation in Europe, especially in the event of crisis situations arising.

As is noted by observers who assess in an unprejudiced way the progress of the work of the Stockholm conference, the adoption of a final document of the forum of full weight and significance is impossible without the attainment of a mutually acceptable agreement on the restriction of military activity.

#### Bloc Initiatives Defended

LD260839 Moscow TASS in English 0826 GMT 26 Aug 86

[Text] Stockholm August 26 TASS -- TASS special correspondents Vladimir Bogachev and Nikolay Vukolov report:

Charles Redman, a spokesman for the U.S. State Department, has recently made a statement on the course of the talks at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, in which he was trying, in particular, to call in question the constructive character of the proposals of the socialist countries on on-site inspection.

The socialist countries have set forth at the current session of the conference their principled stand on the issue of verification of compliance with the agreements being drawn up at the forum. In development of the control concept set forth in the Budapest appeal of the Warsaw Treaty countries, the USSR and the other socialist countries have declared their preparedness to discuss the question of on-site inspection to check on the confidence-building measures on the basis of a limited quota -- one-two inspections a year on the territory of each state. The new initiative of the socialist countries has been positively evaluated by the participants in the forum. Addressing the conference on August 25, Ambassador Wolfgang Loibl, head of the Austrian delegation, said that that highly important step of the socialist countries had created a new situation at the conference and considerably broadened prospects for its successful completion.

In his turn Ambassador Viktor Gauci, head of the Maltese delegation, described that initiative as a real breakthrough in the field of international relations which will bring about considerable progress at the conference. Ambassador Aleksandre Bozovic, head of the Yugoslav delegation, has positively evaluated this approach of the socialist countries.

The statement by the representative of the U.S. State Department, in which he commented on the stance of the socialist countries, sounded, at least, a strange note, since the USA permanently declared its adherence to the idea of on-site inspection. Now that the USSR has put forward a mutually acceptable solution to that problem, the U.S. State Department has described it as a propaganda ploy. The statement by the spokesman for the U.S. State Department is a source of serious concern about the true intentions of the USA. Can it be that they are planning a last-moment attempt at preventing the attainment of agreements by giving up their old positions, including on the question of inspection?

#### Notification Principle Agreed

PM281123 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Aug 86 Second Edition p 1

["At the Stockholm Conference" -- KRASNAYA ZVEZDA headline]

[Text] August 27 TASS -- An important step forward toward achieving results has been made at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. A common stand has been agreed upon in principle on an objectively complicated matter of prior notification of troop movements to Europe from other regions and continents.

Throughout the talks in Stockholm socialist countries consistently declared in favor of prior notification of troop movements that might be a serious source of the destabilization of the military and political situation, of suspiciousness and distrust. Most member-states of the conference gradually demonstrated understanding for this stand.

As a result an arrangement has been achieved that every state will be notifying other participants in the conference of movements of its troops and the further activity of the contingents in Europe will be observed.

A fundamentally new measure of confidence in the military sphere has thus been worked out.

It means the development of the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act and it is fully in accordance with the mandate of the Stockholm conference. The working out of the decision on troop movements actually concludes the list of measures for prior notification of military activity.

Much remains to be done at the conference to agree upon many important matters, specifically to establish the numerical strength of troops of whose movement prior notification must be made, to decide problems of observing and monitoring military activity. The arrangement achieved opens possibility of progress in working out such measures as the exchange of annual plans of military activity which is subject to prior notification, invitation of observers, etc. [Moscow TASS in English at 1512 GMT on 27 Aug carries a similar report that adds the following information: All participants in the talks contributed to the successful solution of the matter by showing political will and the striving to a mutually acceptable compromise.

[The head of Sweden's delegation, Ambassador Curt Lidgard, speaking at today's press conference highly assessed the arrangement achieved. He said that it will undoubtedly be promoting the solution of other problems that are on the agenda of the Stockholm forum.

[The arrangement in Stockholm on prior notification of troop movements is assessed by local observers as a heartening sign since the participants in the conference have shown that with all differences in the approaches of the sides they can and must find solutions to important problems connected with confidence building and security in the European Continent.]

/7358

CSO: 5200/1543

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

FRG PAPER CALLS VERIFICATION KEY TO DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS

No Compromise at MBFR

Frankfurt FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG in German 21 Jul 86 p 8

[Article by Jan Reifenberg: "Verification as the Central Issue"]

[Text] Brussels, 20 Jul--There is no summer break for NATO's political and strategic specialists. The examination of prospects for the establishment of credible deterrence as a basis for successful negotiations on arms reductions between East and West cannot be interrupted. Work goes on in the specialists' committees; in the high-ranking Group for the Investigation of Conventional Arms Reduction from the Atlantic and the Urals, created as the result of a resolution of the last Foreign Ministers' conference in Halifax; and for the specialists concerned with nuclear defense. Further, it is assumed that the second summit meeting between Reagan and Gorbachev will take place in Washington before the end of the year. The developments of the past weeks--the end of the fifth round of the two superpowers' Geneva negotiations, the willingness of Washington and Moscow to hold a special session this week of the Standing Consultative Commission (SCC) on the maintenance of the upper limits of the SALT II agreement, which has in the meantime expired, and for initial talks regarding a cessation or limitation of nuclear weapons testing for the first time in 6 years, as well as the thoroughly positive signs at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe [CDE]--would permit the conclusion that by late autumn at least some progress should be achieved which could then be approved "at the summit." NATO's planners are nonetheless guarding against awakening exaggerated expectations: By their constant consultation with the American ally, and on the basis of their detailed work in the panels from Stockholm to Geneva to Vienna in which NATO participates, they know that difficulties still lie in the gap which exists between the fine-sounding Soviet declarations since January and their actual implementation at the relevant negotiating table.

Everywhere the watchword is verification of the proposals which run the gamut from a 30-50 percent reduction of the stockpiles of both superpowers' strategic long-range weapons, to intermediate-range weapons, the area of conventional troop strength reductions, and to inspection of nuclear



weapons tests. It is gratifying that the Soviet Union declares itself in principle in agreement with the necessity of verification--even proposes it. In the meantime, the West is still waiting for implementation. One need only remember the disappointing conclusion of the last round of the endless Vienna talks on Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions in Europe [MBFR]. The Warsaw Pact's representatives there did not go a single millimeter beyond their old, disappointing proposals. The Western proposal, despite great willingness to oblige, remained unanswered. The East is only prepared for verification if this occurs in times which are free of tension. To be sure, it declares itself willing to establish permanent pass-through checkpoints for troop movements, but excludes from this the approximately 300,000 Soviet armed forces which rotate through Eastern Europe every year. It also makes on-site inspections dependent upon the West credibly proving the requirement for them in advance.

In Stockholm as well it is a matter of proceeding from general allusions to something concrete which could then be brought into the Vienna CSCE follow-up conference if the CDE conference is to achieve positive results by its planned conclusion in September. Again and again NATO has referred to the question--so important for it--of the reduction and control of chemical weapons, but in this case as well Moscow has heretofore always avoided the central question at the multinational Geneva negotiations of the implementation of needed on-site verification.

The impetus for real progress can, in the opinion of NATO specialists, come only from the political leadership of both superpowers. In Brussels they are well aware of the internal debate in Washington, not settled even today, over disarmament, where there are clearly recognizable battle-lines between the Defense Department, the State Department, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the National Security Council. The decision is now up to the President. He must decide which political move will most benefit the United States and the alliance. Reagan has clearly reacted in a positive manner in numerous statements in the past weeks to Gorbachev's most recent series of proposals. He is moving toward the summit without becoming involved in preconditions. He seeks concrete successes and is in agreement with the general secretary in this. In NATO they are convinced that Reagan wishes to bequeath at least initial steps in this direction as his political legacy to his successor, who will move into the White House in 1989. At the same time they point out that the European-American relationship will continue to remain strained as long as Reagan is unable to do anything without having negative intentions ascribed to him by a portion of the West European public while Moscow's proposals are met with a kind of boundless credulity.

In NATO, on the other hand, they are asking whether the Soviet Union would ever have made its present proposals if Reagan had not remained adamant on the research phase of the SDI space defense program, and above all had not made the continued observance of the SALT II upper limits by America dependent upon Moscow's future behavior. There is a fundamental disagreement in Washington on the purpose and practicality of disarmament, to be sure. But only he can deny Reagan's pragmatism who views the President

through the ideologically tinted glasses of European advocates of detente. General Rogers, the NATO commander-in-chief, makes no secret of his concern over the growing alienation of the countries on both sides of the Atlantic. In his view the alliance is presently in a critical state because irrational anti-Americanism in Europe is accompanied by an American aversion to Europe. The American strike against Libya, the debate over SDI, and bills in Congress regarding reductions in American troops in Europe are apt to send misleading signals to Moscow.

In the view of Eastern affairs specialists within NATO, Gorbachev must decide by the end of the year whether or not he will be able to achieve the first concrete agreements with Reagan so that his program for economic modernization can get under way, or if a new armaments spiral in competition with the United States will begin. Since the general secretary cannot proceed without his military people, he must prove to them that there is purpose in the next summit conference. Whether that will be a positive, compelling motive will be seen in the coming months. If one wishes to create one, the alliance must take a uniform approach to the entire complex of problems. If the Kremlin believes that European fears will repeatedly provide it with new Western concessions which threaten Western security without corresponding Eastern actions, the success of the summit talks will be questionable. It is not good to go chasing after the Soviet Union. One must, however, be fully cognizant of the fact that "flanking measures" by the European NATO allies will not be able to determine Washington's course, in the final analysis, if they are not compatible with Reagan's thinking. Thus, Europeans bear a heavy responsibility in the period before the upcoming summit conference. Fear is a poor advisor. Self-confidence as a result of the alliance's success, however, is the order of the day.

#### CDE Nears September Conclusion

Frankfurt FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG in German 22 Jul 86 p 12

[Article by Horst Bacia: "A Signal at the 11th Hour"]

[Text] Stockholm, 21 Jul--At 5 minutes to midnight it appears that a "breakthrough" has yet been achieved at the Stockholm "Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe" [CCDE]. Relieved and with optimism the representatives of the 35 participating countries started the short summer break. Only a few days before the mood had been characterized by uncertainty, and many delegates had vacillated in their evaluation of the conference's outcome between hope and fear. Literally in the final hours of the 11th negotiating round the Soviet Union gave the long-awaited signal of its willingness to negotiate. An agreement has thus come within reasonable distance. To be sure, hard work must still be done in the 5 weeks of discussions left to the Stockholm CCDE before its final session if the "political will" to achieve an agreement is to actually lead to a final document that will be acceptable to all participating countries.

The decisive factor may be whether the as yet unresolved dispute regarding the verification of agreements will be settled to the satisfaction of the West. According to the negotiating mandate which the Stockholm conference received from the CSCE follow-up meeting in Madrid, the confidence-building measures to be agreed upon should be "militarily significant and politically binding" and "accompanied by suitable forms of verification." For the NATO countries, as the head American negotiating team, Ambassador Barry, made clear once again last Friday at the final meeting of the 11th round of negotiations, the "unconditional right to utilize inspections for verification" is a part of that. The chief Soviet delegate, Grinevskiy, confirmed at the same session that the question of verification is "of the greatest importance" for the Warsaw Pact. He called attention to the Budapest proposals of the Pact meeting on conventional disarmament in Europe, which call for on-site inspection, but continued to leave the matter open as to how far the Soviet Union is willing to go in Stockholm. His complexly formulated offer to agree now that confidence-building measures should be tested by on-site inspections "in the process of verification" of disarmament procedures appears to indicate that Moscow indeed accepts the principle of inspection, but would like to postpone its application to the second phase of the CDE, which will be concerned with disarmament. In any case, Ambassador Barry left no doubt that an agreement without inspections would be "incomplete" and would lead to an "unsatisfactory conclusion" of the conference.

For the West, and above all for the United States, the introduction of inspections is a matter of principle. The appropriate and satisfactory verification of agreements has become the West's key requirement in all fora of arms control negotiations--at the U.S.-Soviet talks in Geneva, the MBFR negotiations in Vienna on troop reductions in Central Europe, as well as at the negotiations on chemical weapons in Geneva. Moscow has repeatedly held out the prospect of inspections but has not agreed to them as yet. In the view of the NATO countries, relatively minor demands would be made of the country under inspection during the verification of an agreement on confidence-building measures. Stockholm is thus viewed as the forum where it could be easiest for Moscow to agree to a regulation regarding inspection.

On 30 June the NATO countries tried to get the stalled talks going again by a series of concessions. Since then they have been asking for a right of inspection only once (instead of twice, as previously) per year. This is to be used only in case of serious doubts over compliance with the agreement, and the inspections should be neither "burdensome nor improperly intrusive" for the country involved. Nonetheless, the Soviet Union is apparently finding it difficult to follow up all the talk about inspection rights with an agreement at the negotiating table.

Another obstacle with which the Soviet Union has blocked all progress in the negotiations was removed from the path of the 11th round last week. The East is no longer insisting that independent maneuvers and movements of air force units be included in the announcement of military activities, a cornerstone of the initial concept of confidence-building measures.

Some time ago the demand that the independent activities of naval forces be subject to the announcement requirement was given up after some delaying tactics. The West is prepared to take air and naval forces into consideration for announcement purposes if they are used in conjunction with land forces. The inclusion of independent activities at sea--for example the dispatching of naval units--contradicts the conference mandate that was agreed upon in Madrid, which was contested for so long just because of this point. The announcement of independent air activities--and with this the Soviet Union is aiming above all at the deployment of U.S. aircraft in Europe and the squadrons equipped with atomic bombs which are already based on the continent--is rejected by NATO with the justification that such activities cannot be verified.

The formula upon which the U.S. and Soviet delegations agreed last week after lengthy bilateral talks provides that air force units are only subject to announcement requirements when they are involved in the activities of ground forces and when a certain number of sorties is flown. At the conclusion of the negotiating round, Soviet Ambassador Grinevskiy suggested that this threshold be reduced from 700, the original Moscow proposal, to 200 sorties. With an agreement on the long-controversial air maneuvers, the conference can now turn its attention to the difficult question of what stipulations regarding the announcement of ground forces' activities should apply. (To be sure, the East reserves the right, as in the case of the naval activities, to return at some time, probably as early as at the upcoming CSCE follow-up meeting in Vienna, to its demands.)

In the case of the announcement of maneuvers, NATO abandoned on 30 June the position it had hitherto held (that maneuvers involving at least one division or 6,000 men be announced) and declared its willingness to set the figure higher and to accept a proposal of the neutral and nonaligned countries as a basis for negotiation. According to this, an announcement will be made when at least one division or a certain number of soldiers who belong to combat formations with great fire-power and mobility are involved in a maneuver. To date, the Soviet Union has only proposed a threshold number of 18,000 men. Ambassador Grinevskiy, however, announced to the delegates as they went into the summer break that a reduction would be acceptable to Moscow. The background to this complicated numbers game is the Soviet practice regarding maneuvers, whereby the clear threshold number of the CSCE Final Act (25,000 men) is rarely exceeded. Moreover, only portions of a division usually exercise in the Soviet Union. It is therefore the goal of NATO and some countries in the neutral and nonaligned group to find a formula in which the stipulation of a structural concept (a division) is combined with a threshold number as low as possible. Only in this manner would the Warsaw Pact be required to announce considerably more maneuvers than in the past.

This single example shows how difficult the details are for the most part about which the conference in its five working groups must yet agree. It will need all the time which remains when it convenes on 19 August for its 12th and last round of negotiations, which will last barely 5 weeks.

A French proposal, which was supported by the Soviet Union, to convene informally during the negotiating break as well, could only be put through to a limited degree. The neutral and nonaligned countries, in whose ranks especially many were irritated over this initiative, found an elegant solution which offends no one but complies with France's wish to a limited extent only: They will, as Swiss Ambassador Schenk expounded in the name of the neutral and nonaligned nations at the conclusion of the negotiating round, be present in Stockholm from 12 August on--that is, 1 week earlier--"for informal consultations." Since the neutral countries provide the coordinators in the five working groups, the conference cannot conduct business--even informally--without them.

13238/9604

CSO: 5200/2730

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: WHITE HOUSE 'DISPLEASED' AT ARMS CURB PUBLICITY

PM251812 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Aug 86 Morning Edition p 4

[A. Shalnev article under the general heading "Toward a Future Without Wars or Weapons": "Considered Replies and Hasty Rejections"]

[Text] White House Chief of Staff Donald Regan, a man who wields such influence in the President's immediate entourage that he is often called the prime minister of the Reagan administration, is displeased.

He is displeased with the press which, from his viewpoint, is paying too much attention to arms control questions when commenting on the state of Soviet-U.S. relations and assessing the prospects for their development. That is precisely what the Soviets want, Reagan argues. But the United States has its own agenda.

Regan is echoed by his immediate subordinate, White House Deputy Press Secretary Larry Speakes. There are "not just arms control questions" on the agenda of our relations with the Soviet Union, he reiterated to journalists.

Indeed, no one denies that. As two great powers, nuclear powers, the Soviet Union and the United States do indeed have much to discuss. For example, the situation in the Near East, in southern Africa, or in the Asia and Pacific region. But the two states' greatest responsibility consists in ridding mankind -- all mankind -- of the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

The Soviet Union has reaffirmed by concrete actions its readiness to assume that responsibility. That indeed was how the USSR's decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions was received throughout the world. It is quite natural that arms control questions are again occupying the central, key place in press reports, as they should.

But that displeases the White House. The main reason for its discontent apparently is that the Reagan administration has been cornered. It has cornered itself: None of its declarations on its commitment to world peace or the need for nuclear disarmament has been backed up by a single concrete action, not one in all the current administration's 5 and 1/2 years in office.

And when the press, both the U.S. and world press, carries out another detailed, thorough, and objective discussion on arms control questions, there is nothing to do but draw a line through the column marked "U.S. actions."

There is clearly no point reminding the White House of this. As THE NEW YORK TIMES stresses, "the administration is now having difficulties imparting the necessary thrust to the public debates on questions concerning nuclear tests. Administration officials are noting that, in the public's opinion, nuclear tests are synonymous with the arms race and that the idea of ending such tests is one which impresses the public. Thus, officials face a difficult task of proving that they are right and of proving that "the continuation of tests is necessary."

Necessary to whom? To the United States and its friends and allies, the White House claims. This is not so, the Americans themselves say, and in reflection of their feelings both houses of Congress recently adopted a resolution containing what is essentially a demand that the United States accept the Soviet moratorium. This is not so, America's allies and friends are saying, and among them, according to London's THE GUARDIAN, "there are political leaders who consider a complete and general test ban to be a simple means of ending the nuclear arms race."

Then who does need them? Although the answer is an old one, it has lost none of its topicality for all that. The refusal to end nuclear tests is needed by those people for whom mountains of weapons are synonymous with mountains of money; in other words, the military-industrial complex.

But it is not only and not so much the press with which the White House is dissatisfied. Most of all it is dissatisfied with the Soviet Union which, by extending the moratorium and demonstrating once more that its words are not at variance with its deeds, has shown a statecraft of courage so necessary for progress along the path of nuclear disarmament.

Having said "no!" literally minutes after M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, had finished speaking on Soviet television, the White House is now bearing down on the press and, through it, the public, both in America and the world.

The White House chief of staff, who during the President's vacation is now providing the main commentaries and clarifications on foreign policy questions, also said the following: "Both sides should continue tests so long as we have stocks of nuclear weapons..."

That comment is significant. It not only confirms the administration's intention to continue explosions which, most specialists are convinced, the United States needs to step up the development [razrabotka] of "star wars" armaments. By that comment the White House is also demonstrating that it cannot abandon its utter obsession of not simply suggesting but dictating to foreign peoples and governments what they policy should be.

It only remains to be hoped that what is now being heard from California is not the last word and that the Soviet Union, and indeed the world as a whole, will yet be given a considered reply rather than a hasty one.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1542

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

JPRS-TAC-86-075  
18 September 1986

### USSR: FURTHER COMMENTARY ON MORATORIUM EXTENSION

#### IZVESTIYA Editorial

PM221206 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Aug 86 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Call to Reason"]

[Text] For a fourth time the Soviet Union has extended its moratorium on nuclear explosions, which it introduced unilaterally on the 40th anniversary of the Hiroshima tragedy. It goes without saying that such a decision was not an easy one to make: In the past 12 months the silence at our test ranges has been shattered 18 times by the echo of explosions in Nevada.

Is it advisable to maintain the moratorium when the United States continues its nuclear tests? Is the risk not too great, is time not working against the country's security? The Soviet Union has had sufficient justification for resuming its nuclear tests. But the Soviet Union has not resumed them, thus giving the Washington administration more time to take advantage of the historic opportunity on the path toward ending the arms race.

Why does the USSR attach such great significance to this step?

The cessation of tests closes the door to the improvement of existing and the creation of new, more sophisticated, arms systems and systems of mass destruction weapons. That is surely the fundamental reason for the difficult decision made by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the Soviet Government after comprehensively and meticulously weighing all the reasons "for" and "against" the decision. We are not merely proposing that these doors be closed. We are actually closing them. As General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee M.S. Gorbachev stressed in his statement on Soviet television, "the Soviet Union's moratorium on nuclear explosions, as an action and not just a proposal, really proves the seriousness and sincerity of our nuclear disarmament program and of our appeals for a new policy -- a policy of realism, peace, and cooperation."

By extending the moratorium we are confirming our readiness to assume that very high responsibility that rests on the Soviet Union as a socialist state and a nuclear power, whose duty is to make every effort to prevent global catastrophe and spare mankind from death in the fire of an atomic conflagration.



What can be more convincing or demonstrative than practical deeds? The Soviet Union is making a weighty and concrete contribution to the solution of international security problems, believing that its initiatives will generate a chain reaction of active response measures from other states and governments, measures capable of ensuring accelerated progress along the path of curbing and ending the arms race. The program of general nuclear disarmament by the year 2000 offers the broadest operational scope for peace-loving actions. It only needs the desire to move toward that goal, a desire not in the form of high-flown declarations but of concrete deeds.

Guided by its strategy of peace, the USSR does not limit itself to words: Constructive proposals have been placed on the table at bilateral talks and international forums -- be it in Vienna, Geneva, or Stockholm; an appeal to ensure security and cooperation in the Asia and Pacific region was announced in Vladivostok; and at the United Nations in New York an appeal was made to establish "star peace" and lay the foundations for an all-embracing international security system.

This is not only the result of a sincere desire for a world without weapons or wars, it is a manifestation of the highest statesmanship and of that new way of thinking that is so necessary to the modern world, which is tired of living in conditions of the "balance of terror." Is that not why the Soviet initiatives meet with such a broad response of approval and gratitude throughout the world and, of course, in our own country, too. Soviet people resolutely support the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state and persistently demand that the foreign policy course of the 27th CPSU Congress be continued.

But from the White House what you hear is that joining in the moratorium "would not meet the security interests of the United States or our friends and allies" since tests are "necessary to maintain the reliability and effectiveness of nuclear weapons, which, for the foreseeable future, will remain the key element of our deterrence potential."

The statement on the intention to maintain nuclear weapons "for the foreseeable future" is on the White House's conscience. By this statement the White House effectively negates the President's solemn declarations at the Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva, where the sides' intention to work to end the nuclear arms race on earth and prevent it in space was confirmed.

To speak on behalf of one's "friends and allies" and -- by implication -- on behalf of the whole world about what their interests should be is to demonstrate a kind of thinking that has become dangerously out of step with the process of profound changes in international life and to continue leading a life in which you view the world as your own backyard.

The world does not think as Washington does on whether or not the moratorium meets the interests of the planet's peoples. It is no coincidence that the leaders of countries from four continents -- India, Greece, Mexico, Tanzania, Sweden, and Argentina -- in their recent "Mexico Declaration" renewed their appeal on the cessation of all nuclear tests. Nor is it any coincidence that the Soviet moratorium has been approved by the UN General Assembly, the most representative assembly of states in the world.

As for the mood in the United States itself, here is what Dr Bernard Lowne, cochairman of the international movement International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, has written to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee: "The Soviet Union has ceased nuclear explosions, and that action is far more eloquent than any solemn speech... A Soviet-U.S. reciprocal moratorium on nuclear tests meets the interests of the United States and of all people."

It meets the interests of the United States and of all people... But Washington stubbornly refused to recognize that fact and persistently refused to see that the world was irreversibly changed in August 1945 and that attempts to ensure one's own security without regard for the security of other countries and people and attempts to rush ahead and achieve military superiority are doomed to failure. By displaying prenuclear thinking, which lost its significance more than 40 years ago at the time of the Hiroshima tragedy, Washington is saying that what the Soviet Union does is mere propaganda, a tactical ploy designed for world public opinion.

But the world would only welcome it if the United States responded in the same way and took a step aimed at the international public and if the response to the silence at our test ranges was finally silence in Nevada, too.

Perceiving our readiness for compromise and for measures as fundamental as a unilateral moratorium as evidence that America's might is wearing the Soviet Union down and weakening its political will is a delusion. It is an extremely dangerous illusion, based on the long obsolete notion of what international relations and, in particular, what relations between two nuclear powers should be. There are false premises that cannot be used in the search for honest agreements and the improvement of the international climate.

By extending its moratorium again the USSR is openly and forthrightly saying that the United States should impartially assess the situation that has taken shape and end its delusions regarding the Soviet Union and its foreign policy. There is still time to do that. But it is diminishing all the time.

#### Petrosyants on Verification

LD211734 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1125 GMT 21 Aug 86

["Andranik Petrosyants on Questions of Verification [Kontrol]" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 21 Aug (TASS) -- White House Chief of Staff Donald Regan, who is at present with President Reagan in California, has spoken to journalists.

Responding to a question from a correspondent of the U.S. television company ABC on M.S. Gorbachev's proposal to sign an agreement on banning nuclear tests during the summit meeting, D. Regan said: "We are not against a treaty on a universal and complete ban on nuclear weapons tests, but against the conclusion of such a treaty without an appropriate system of verification [proverka]. We want to have the ability to verify what they are doing, and we think that they also want to know what we are doing. If we can achieve success on the issue of verification [proverka] and can be sure of its efficiency, then perhaps progress could also be achieved on the level of concluding a treaty."

Andranik Petrosyants, head of the Soviet delegation at the talks on ending nuclear weapons tests, chairman of the USSR State Committee on the Use of Atomic Energy, comments on the statement by the representative of the U.S. Administration in PRAVDA today.

"I agree with Mr Donald Regan that questions of verification [kontrol] are an important element in a future treaty on a comprehensive ban of nuclear tests," Andranik Petrosyants said. "That is precisely why these matters were the subject of detailed discussions 6 years ago at the tripartite talks with the participation of the Soviet Union, the United States and Great Britain."

"Soviet proposals henceforth on matters of verification [kontrol] have been specified in the document 'Basic Tenets of a Treaty on the Complete and Universal Banning of Nuclear Weapons Tests', which was examined by the 37th session of the UN General Assembly in 1982. That envisaged that verification of observance of the provisions of the treaty would be founded on a combination of national and international measures. National measures in their turn included the use of national technical means of verification [kontrol] and the transmission of data received on the basis of these means to be at the disposal of other participants in the treaty.

"International measures, alongside the consultations and exchanges of information generally accepted in accords and treaties, envisaged, first and foremost, an exchange of seismological data, that being the most efficient instrument for registering the conduct of a nuclear explosion.

"For this purpose, each participant in the treaty would assign a series of seismological stations, which would, through a specially created body, participate in an international exchange of seismological data. Also envisaged were a communications system, the creation of centers for processing the seismological data and their deployment and so on for the creation of a system for the exchange of seismological data. Our proposal envisaged the formation of a special committee of experts from the states participating in the treaty."

A. Petrosyants went on to say that on-site verification [proverka no meste] was envisaged in the proposal of the Soviet Union as an important integral measure of verification [kontrol]. "We proposed the detailed elaboration of a procedure of such verifications [proverka], an order for their execution, including a list of rights and functions of verification personnel, and the role of the receiving side during verification.

"Moreover, it was proposed that provisions be included in the treaty enabling any two or more states taking part to reach agreement on additional measures of verifying its observance.

"Thus, our principled position on the matters of verification [kontrol] was set out in the speech by M.S. Gorbachev on 14 July 1986 at a meeting with representatives of the International Forum of Scientists for a Nuclear Test Ban: '...The Soviet Union agrees to adopt the widest, any [lyuboy] forms of verification [kontrol] -- both national and international, including even on-site inspection [inspektsiya na mestakh]...'

"Moreover, agreeing to the installation of U.S. monitoring [kontrolnyy] equipment in the Semipalatinsk area in July this year is practical confirmation of our readiness to adopt international measures of verification [kontrol].

"At the same time, representatives of the U.S. Administration at various levels, speculating on the need to continue the strategy of so-called 'nuclear deterrence' view a treaty on a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapons tests only as a distant prospect for the United States. And so, artificial questions of the complexity and reliability of verification [kontrol] measures are being used as an impediment on the path to drafting such a treaty, and with the aim of concealing the true stand of the U.S. Administration: its unwillingness to disarm.

"The statement by Mr Reagan on the outside looks like a positive shift in the stand of the U.S. Administration. But how real it is will be shown by the next meeting of our delegations -- U.S. and Soviet -- at the talks in September this year in Geneva on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests," A. Petrosyants concluded.

LD221348 Moscow TASS in English 1340 GMT 22 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 22 TASS -- The Soviet Union is prepared for any forms of control over a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapon tests: national and international, including on-site inspection, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, has pointed out.

Speaking at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists here today, he recalled that the Soviet Union has agreed to the installation of American equipment in the Semipalatinsk region.

There appeared commentaries in the West, which belittled the Soviet decision to extend the unilateral nuclear test moratorium, Gerasimov said. They claim that before introducing the moratorium, the Soviet Union had modernized its nuclear forces, while the United States, purportedly, should conduct testing in order to catch up with the Soviet Union.

The Soviet spokesman emphasized that the U.S. had detonated far more nuclear explosions and the point at issue was not so much the modernization and perfection of American weapons, but the development of new weapons, including space-based arms.

Gerasimov said that if both the U.S. and the Soviet Union gave up nuclear testing, the two sides would find themselves in the same position. The further perfection of nuclear weapons would be hampered, and this would benefit all -- the USSR, the U.S. and the entire world.

The Soviet proposals indicated that ending tests was a step toward cutting armaments, eliminating nuclear, chemical and other weapons. The logic of events advanced the question of ending nuclear tests to the foreground.

The Soviet spokesman pointed out that agreement could be reached and a corresponding document signed this year at a Soviet-American summit meeting.

#### U.S. Public Opinion

LD232221 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 23 Aug 86

[By Tomas Kolesnichenko, member of the PRAVDA editorial board; from the "Vremya" newscast.]

[Text] The extension of the Soviet moratorium is an example of how international policies should be based not on words but on specific deeds -- it is action and not merely a proposal. We can frankly say that it opens a new stage in the struggle for the destruction of nuclear weapons. It is also an example of new thinking, reason, and commonsense so critically needed by the contemporary world. And an interesting fact here is that we get, shall we say, feedback: Seeing our example, millions of people throughout the world are also departing from the so-called prenuclear thinking and beginning to perceive in ever greater depth that, today, one can no longer ensure one's own security without taking into consideration the security of other states and people.

In the United States, for example, a little more than a year ago in public opinion polls, just over one-third of those polled supported a nuclear test ban. Then it was more than 50 percent of the polled people. One of the polls taken a few days ago shows that now 80 percent of Americans support a nuclear test ban agreement.

It also opens the way to the summit meeting. I, for example, cannot understand what they are to discuss at the summit meeting in Washington if there are no specific questions of disarmament, mutual security, and elimination of nuclear weapons on the negotiating table. They can't just talk about the splendor of the Potomac or the fine monuments in the parks of the U.S. capital, can they?

So what's holding things up? So far everything has been coming up against the unwillingness of the U.S. Administration to listen not just to our voice of reason but also the voice of its own people.

And that's despite the fact that a mutual Soviet-U.S. nuclear explosion ban meets the interests of the United States itself too, as well as the interests of all other people. Currently the Washington leaders are twisting and turning, maneuvering. But that is not what equally their own country and the whole world are expecting of them. One would like to hope that in the American evaluations and actions, realism and understanding of the inevitability of putting an end to the mindless arm race will come out on top in the end. That is precisely what the message that our country has sent to the U.S. Government, the American people, and the people and governments of all countries is calling for. Judging from the mass wave of approval in response, the message has reached the hearts and minds of millions of people on our planet.

#### Moscow Demonstration

LD231131 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 23 Aug 86

[Text] Scores of thousands of demonstrators flooded the streets of Moscow this morning to express support for the extension of the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests till 1st January 1987. Mass meetings took place in different parts of the city, in squares, parks and stadiums.

The Soviet Union, speakers at the meetings said, took another step aimed at averting the threat of a nuclear holocaust. The USSR has been refraining from nuclear tests for more than a year now.

In their statements at the meetings workers, scientists, writers and doctors urged the U.S. Administration to join the Soviet moratorium. They called for a universal ban on nuclear tests.

The Muscovites addressed an appeal to the residents of the world's biggest capitals, urging them to support the new Soviet peace initiatives.

#### Further Report

LD232200 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1430 GMT on 23 August opens its regular "Vremya" newscast with a 17-minute report on marches and rallies held in Moscow in support of the USSR's extension of the nuclear test moratorium.

Reporter Ye. Sinitsyn begins the report by saying: "It seems as if all of Moscow has come out into the streets today." Meanwhile as the camera pans across rows of marchers carrying banners denouncing the arms race, SDI and war. Sinitsyn chats to some of the participants who praise Gorbachev's latest offer, reflect on the horrors of World War II, and express their concern for the children's future.

The camera then switches to Gorkiy Park where according to a reporter, "tens of thousands of workers assembled for an antiwar rally." A worker is heard speaking on the importance of the Soviet Union's latest nuclear test moratorium offer.

Reporter A. Gilkin is then shown mingling with marchers in Moscow's Prospect Mira, and he asks several of them why they are there. One, an elderly man, answers: "I took part in the war. I was 17 when I ended up at the front and although 40 years have passed since then, my memories of the war have not faded. I think we must once again remind the U.S. Administration that the Soviet people want to live in peace. If they still do not understand our wishes, I think that -- I am certain that -- every Soviet citizen, our government and our state will be capable of responding in such a way that the Americans will realize that we are strong enough to defend peace."

Galkin then asks a younger man whether he thinks the Soviet Union has given away too much and is rendering itself defenseless against the Americans. The answer is "no I admire the self-restraint shown by our government. I think they are incapable of acting without thinking things out and have taken into account our capabilities. If need be we can exert ourselves as, for example, during the Great Patriotic War and at other times, and concentrate our efforts. Our people are capable of this and we will always support."

A recording of a speech made during another "thousands-strong" rally outside the National Economic Achievements Exhibition by (N.G. Fotiyev) an engine driver and delegate to the 12th World Youth Festival, is then carried. He is heard asking. "Have you, Mr Reagan, not had enough of atomic brinkmanship? No more delaying and procrastination! Ignoring the opinion of the people of the world is a political crime."

Another rally, in front of Moscow State University, is shown, with I.V. Kirichenko, "a leading researcher at the Institute of World Economic and International Relations," speaking. He says "as you know, the term nuclear winter has recently come into circulation, and it is simply amazing how irresponsibly certain people in the United States are beginning to claim that nuclear winter is merely Soviet propaganda. Moreover, they claim that it is possible to survive a nuclear war sitting in a refuge -- an underground refuge with underground gardens and underground farms. Billionaires are already building such farms and refuges. Sheer madness! Why is it that several dozen monopolies raking in billions of dollars in profits from military orders are putting life on earth at stake, putting our children's lives at stake." He continues: "I think that all women on the earth should join together to form a single union -- a union for saving our children from the horrors of a new world war. We need peace! Peace, peace and again peace!"

Reporter B. Parkhomenko then speaks about peace and disarmament to the Moscow university students, one from Bolivia and the other from Madagascar, who say the "Today, alongside the Soviet people, all honest people on the planet are voting for peace."

The report ends with several more short interviews with Soviet citizens who express their disapproval of U.S. policy, followed by a speech on peace by poetess (I. Kazakova) at the Leniniskiy Komsomol Motor Vehicle Works.

Dailies Comments Reviewed

PM221210 [Editorial Report] The major Moscow dailies for 22 August continue to devote considerable space to comment on Gorbachev's 18 August television statement on extending the nuclear test moratorium. Front-page readers' letters and reports from around the USSR voicing what a PRAVDA introduction describes as Soviet people's "full support" for the statement are supplemented by editorials in IZVESTIYA and KRASNAYA ZVEZDA and foreign news page roundups of reaction from around the world.

PRAVDA's page 4 roundup of expressions of approval for the statement and criticism of the U.S. stance on nuclear arms control includes quotations from Romania's Ceausescu; Polish Christian Social Union Chairman Morawski; PCI Directorate member Rubbi; London MORNING STAR Editor Chater; a couple of French workers; and Canadian, Brazilian, Japanese newspapers and also an own correspondent New York dispatch citing David Cortright, executive director of the SANE: A Citizens' Organization for a Sane World, urging the U.S. Administration to end nuclear tests in response to the Soviet example and claiming that 80 percent of Americans questioned in an opinion poll want a test ban treaty and a second U.S.-Soviet summit.

The same page also features a political observer Yuriy Zhukov article supportive of Gorbachev's remarks.

IZVESTIYA's page 4 roundup, centered on a cartoon depicting a man in a stars-and-stipes hat atop a pile of missiles who is saying "See, we're still not ready for an agreement," consists of statements from a Rome municipal official; Italian writer Alberto Moravia; East bloc leaders Truong Chinh, Husak, and Batmonh; the Mexican Government; FRG Foreign Minister Genscher; the London MORNING STAR; French television; and the Luanda JORNAL DO ANGOLA; a V. Kuznetsov Geneva dispatch incorporating brief interviews with various disarmament conference delegation heads; and a Yu. Savenkov Beijing dispatch on PRC press reaction. Kuznetsov's dispatch reads in full:

"The attention of delegates at the Disarmament Conference is centered on the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Those who addressed the session emphasized the importance of the Soviet peace initiative that offers new opportunities for the termination of the nuclear arms race. V. Kuznetsov, IZVESTIYA's correspondent in Geneva, asked some heads of delegation to give their opinion on this issue.

"Canadian Ambassador J.A. Beasley: The Soviet Union's decision was thoroughly considered; the USSR studied all aspects of this complex and important problem and also took into account the position of many participants in the Disarmament Conference advocating the termination of nuclear tests. M.S. Gorbachev's statement is very interesting and we must study its full text carefully, because the fundamental aspects of this statement directly concern the agenda of the current Disarmament Conference session.

"Yugoslav delegation head Kazimir Vidas: The Soviet Government's decision is remarkable. It was awaited with interest at the conference. M.S. Gorbachev's statement reflects a real desire to find a solution to complex international problems and to help get the work of the Disarmament Conference out of the deadlock. Real opportunities to halt the nuclear arms race not only on earth but also in space now hinge on the question of terminating nuclear weapon tests.



"I am particularly gratified by the fact that the Soviet Union's present stance takes into account the results of the latest meeting of the leaders of the six states in Mexico. The consideration for public opinion on such a cardinal issue of disarmament reflects not only the Soviet Union's respectful attitude toward nonaligned and neutral states but also the desire to constantly modify [korrektirovat] its foreign policy and to seek the best possible options for solving the problems of preventing nuclear war and the practical transition to universal and total disarmament.

"GDR Delegation Head Harald Rose: The decision to extend the moratorium until the end of the year is an expression of the Soviet Union's consistent course of easing international tension, solving the questions of disarmament, and strengthening peace and international security. Seeking a solution to contemporary problems along the path of intensifying the nuclear arms race and shifting it into space is a dangerous undertaking and its completely divorced from the military and political realities of the age." Savenkov's Beijing dispatch reads in full: The Chinese newspapers have published a XINHUA report devoted to M.S. Gorbachev's Soviet television statement on the Soviet Union's decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions until 1 January 1987. RENMIN RIBAO carries the report beneath the headline 'The Soviet Union Extends the Moratorium on Nuclear Tests Once Again. The United States Declares That Ending Tests Is Not in Its Interests'. It singles out the part of the statement that says 'the Soviet Union is convinced that an agreement on the termination of nuclear tests can be reached quickly and can be signed this very year at a Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

"The newspaper CHINA DAILY quotes the words by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee: 'I appeal to U.S. President Ronald Reagan to dispassionately assess the situation that has taken shape, discard all irrelevancies, and overcome delusions about the Soviet Union and its policy.' At the same time the newspaper quotes a XINHUA report from the United States that the U.S. Air Force has embarked on modernization of the B-52 bomber for the transportation of cruise missiles, in other words it has taken a step placing the United States outside the framework of the SALT II treaty."

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's page 3 coverage, carried under the general heading "An Act of State Wisdom," consists of a TASS roundup of "high assessments" of the statement from RUDE PRAVO, a PRC Foreign Ministry spokesman (cited as stating that "to achieve effective nuclear disarmament we advocate that the two biggest nuclear powers first end the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons and also reduce their nuclear arms to a considerable extent"), THE NEW YORK TIMES, Australian Foreign Minister Hayden, a Spanish Foreign Ministry spokesman, the Athens newspaper RIZOSPASTIS, Tokoy's ASAHI, the AAPSO, the JORNAL DO BRASILIA, and International Democratic Federation of Women Secretary General M. Vire-Tuominen; a photograph taken on Capitol Hill captioned "Participants in a Washington demonstration urge the U.S. Government to join the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests"; and an article by Czechoslovak commentator Jiri Cirtek stating that his "compatriots, like all sensible people in earth, welcome and ardently support the Soviet Union's historic decision" as a "yet another significant step toward a world in which mankind will not be threatened by destruction in the flames of a nuclear catastrophe."



PM261000 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Aug 86 First Edition p 4

[PRAVDA political observer Yuriy Zhukov article: "A New, Decisive Stage"]

[Text] Our planet is vast, but in the age of electronic communications billions of people are learning news that could be of profound interest to them in a matter of seconds.

In Moscow it was 2100 when M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, appeared on viewers' television screens to deliver a statement on one of the key problems of international politics -- the problem of banning nuclear tests. Within an hour Moscow received the first responses to this statement.

The USSR decision to once again extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests, its appeal to Americans' reason and dignity, and its appeal to the U.S. President not to miss another historic chance on the road to ending the arms race are the subject of lively comment throughout the world.

However, at President R. Reagan's California ranch, where his office has been transferred for the vacation period, they are pretending that nothing has happened. When correspondents spoke to White House spokesman L. Speakes, he said that they "had not yet seen" the text of the Soviet leader's statement but nevertheless said in the same breath that he "does not think there is anything specific in the Soviet proposal." Anonymous "high-ranking representatives" of the U.S. Administration, the State Department, and the Pentagon hastened to say, as a CNN television correspondent reported, that "the question of signing an agreement on ending nuclear tests this year at a summit meeting is really not on the American delegation's agenda at the forthcoming meeting."

These initial responses from "high-ranking U.S. representatives" confirm that they have no wish to renounce their old, militarist way of thinking. True, at the same time cheerful assertions that the Soviet leader's statement "opens the way" for a new Soviet-American summit meeting have begun to be heard across the ocean.

In this connection first of all it is permissible to ask: Has the Soviet Union placed any obstacles in the way of this meeting before? Has it "closed the way" to such a meeting by its actions? The Soviet Union has always been and still is an advocate of summit meetings, which provide an opportunity to discuss and resolve the most important issues of interstate relations!

But I -- and probably many other Soviet people -- have several more legitimate questions: How does Washington conceive of dialogue at summit level? What would it like to discuss? What results does it expect?

Let us consider. The American Administration, as we have discovered from the latest statements by its spokesmen, has no wish to join the moratorium on nuclear explosions. It does not even want to hear about ending nuclear tests. It also does not intend to discuss the question of preventing the militarization of space -- this, incidentally, has also been confirmed by the President himself. It does not wish to renounce nuclear weapons -- on the contrary, it is in a hurry to create more and more new varieties of them that are even more lethal.

In vain do I seek an answer to simple, clear questions in the statements by leading U.S. figures: How do they imagine a summit meeting? What, in their opinion, must be discussed by the leaders of the two largest powers? The weather, or what? Or are they to talk about everything and nothing, so to speak, leaving aside the most burning problem of today - the problem of preventing a nuclear space war?

When you read what is now being written in Washington and hear over and over again what is being said -- that they have no intention of accepting the Soviet proposal to draw up an agreement on ending nuclear tests and sign it this year at the summit meeting -- then for me personally the question cannot help arising: What then is the point in the USSR and U.S. leaders meeting?

I believe, however, that life will nevertheless compel these gentlemen to understand that the time of total license has passed and sunk into oblivion.

If, for example, State Department Spokesman Redman allowed himself to reject the idea of the United States joining the Soviet moratorium 45 minutes before the beginning of the speech by the Soviet leader, this not only attests to a violation of the elementary norms of diplomatic conduct but also to a total lack of understanding of the current international situation. Washington has failed to understand or else has no wish to grasp the main point: Whether it likes it or not, the Soviet moratorium is working for the cause of peace and working successfully, and the longer Washington turns a blind eye to this the greater the moral and political damage it will incur.

Oh how much the bosses of the American military-industrial complex who set the tone in the U.S. capital would like the USSR to resume its nuclear tests! How hard they tried, conducting 18 tests one after the other in Nevada, hoping to provoke us to renounce our moratorium!

The Soviet Union, however, has not given in to the provocation. It has issued a calm, firm warning: If necessary, our power will be able to respond to any challenges from the United States, including its infamous program of preparation of "star wars." An answer will be found quickly, and it will not be what the United States expects. The country's security is a sacred matter for Soviet people and will be ensured. But we proceed from the fact that the political course mapped out by the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and elaborated upon by the 27th CPSU Congress creates real possibilities to curb bellicose militarists, eliminate nuclear weapons, and change the development of events for the better.

Yes, our moratorium, which, as time has shown, has been an impressive, clear measure as far as hundreds of millions of people are concerned, is exerting an ever-increasing influence not only on broad public opinion but also on political parties, governments, and the policies of many states.

The true nature of the present Washington administration's aggressive policy is becoming increasingly evident. It is no accident that even NATO Supreme Allied Commander in Europe General Rogers recently said that the alliance between the United States and its allies is at present experiencing "an acutely critical period" -- the allies are increasingly persistently demanding that their "big brother" switch from dangerous confrontation with the socialist countries to seeking mutually acceptable solutions.

Outside NATO the moratorium is having an even stronger impact on the international situation. An authoritative group of six countries has formed that represents four continents and consists of India, Argentina, Mexico, Sweden, Greece, and Tanzania. They are consistently in favor of banning nuclear tests and ending the arms race. Their position is shared by the majority of nonaligned states. The Soviet peace initiatives are actively supported by the UN General Assembly.

Even in the United States, where any peace initiative of ours is either presented in a distorted way and condemned or passed over in total silence, our moratorium is also working. The hospitality recently shown by the Americans to participants in the Kiev-New York Cycle Race for Peace and the Mississippi Peace Cruise organized by the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace in conjunction with members of American antiwar movements, and also the influx of American delegations and tourist groups to the USSR are a clear illustration of this.

Whereas only this spring a mere 42 percent of Americans were in favor of banning nuclear tests, this summer more than half of them -- 56 percent -- are in favor of this step.

Whereas last year, after the announcement of our moratorium, only a few individuals in the U.S. Congress spoke in favor of joining it, in July this year their number had reached 150. And the other day, by a majority of 234 to 155, the House of Representatives decided to stop financing tests of nuclear weapons with a yield of more than 1 kiloton.

The number of peace organizations in the United States is growing. Whereas in 1984 there were 1,350 organizations working for peace, in 1985 another 4,000 local antiwar organizations and 200 national ones made their appearance. This year their total number has reached 5,700. As time goes on, these organizations more frequently establish cooperation with Soviet antiwar movements. This is understandable: People are becoming increasingly aware of the terrible, bloody impasse into which America is being led by its present leaders, who are crazy about the arms race.

How much further can they go if, for example, THE WASHINGTON POST can publish an article under heading "The Creation of Forces for the Period after (!) World War III," which states: "Behind the scenes, often in total secrecy, members of the military have spent almost \$20 billion to create a command, control, communications, and intelligence network -- a network the pentagon calls 'C 3I' -- of which a large part is intended to survive a long nuclear war.... This will allow the United States to prepare for a fourth (!) world war."

The delirium of the maniacs obsessed by ideas of a third and even a fourth world war is counteracted by the calm but firm and decisive peace-loving political course taken by the USSR and the fraternal socialist countries -- a course dictated by the new thinking of the nuclear age. As time goes on, millions of people in the West are becoming more deeply aware that in the nuclear age it is only conceivable to ensure security by political, not military means and it is impossible to safeguard the security of some at the cost of weakening the security of others,

But as Washington clearly has no wish to reckon with this reality, people everywhere, including the United States, are reaching the inevitable conclusion with increasing certainty that the time has now come for decisive, responsible action. They realize that the statement by the general secretary of CPSU central committee on 18 August creates favorable conditions for the immediate development of such action. I stress: immediate!

Therefore, a new stage in the struggle to prevent a nuclear war is already beginning -- an exceptionally important state, if not a decisive one.

The situation as a whole is favorable for achieving success in this struggle. The defenders of peace are now armed with a well-balanced, logical program of action intelligible to all.

People can see:

The 15 January Soviet proposals to eliminate nuclear weapons throughout the world by the year 2000 are fully in line with the demands of the age.

The package of constructive proposals that the USSR has submitted at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons opens up the way to accords:

The complex of measures to reduce armed forces and conventional arms in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals proposed by the Soviet Union in conjunction with its Warsaw pact allies awaits discussion and adoption.

The broad program drawn up by the USSR to ensure security and cooperation in Asia and the Pacific is in the vital interest not only of the people of this region but also of the whole world.

The Soviet plan for "star peace" that counters the American "star wars" program and envisages the formation of a world space organization awaits discussion in the United Nations.

The new Soviet proposals on chemical weapons make it possible to sign a convention by the end of this year or next year on banning these weapons and eliminating stockpiles of them, as well as the industrial base for their manufacture.

The proposals submitted at the Stockholm conference by the USSR and fraternal socialist countries in cooperation with other participants in this conference have opened the way for reaching important agreements on the nonuse of force, the notification of military exercises and troop movements, the exchange of annual plans for military activity, and verification.

The Soviet plan for setting up international procedures for the safe development of nuclear power has been submitted for discussion with all interested organizations.

The socialist countries have drawn up proposals on the formation of a comprehensive international security system, which await discussion at the next UN General Assembly session.

No one can refute the indisputable fact that solution of the urgent, burning problem of the current day -- the problem of banning nuclear tests -- would serve as a prologue to implementing this comprehensive program and to radically improving the world situation.

PM270854 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Aug 86 Morning Edition p 5

["IZVESTIYA Round Table" interview with Gene LaRocque, head of the Center for Defense Information, and Prof Mikhail Milshteyn, senior scientific employee of the USSR Academy of Sciences United States and Canada Institute, by special correspondent Aleksandr Palladin: "Will the Explosions in Nevada cease" -- first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] Demonstrating a love of peace, goodwill, and a desire to curb the arms race, the Soviet leadership has once again decided to extend the unilateral moratorium that it imposed on nuclear explosions more than a year ago. In his statement on Soviet television on 18 August M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed that this very responsible decision was made in the interests of all the people of the world and was dictated by the need to halt the locomotive of militarism leading mankind to the nuclear abyss. The world has thus been given an opportunity to judge who really wants to end the reckless course that benefits the arms manufacturers alone, and who continues to choose peace-making phraseology, essentially amounting to the assertion that the shortest path to disarmament is paved with missiles and bombs, in preference to new thinking consonant with the modern era.

This is discussed by a retired U.S. Navy admiral and a retired Soviet lieutenant general who actively campaign for the easing of tension and the elimination of the threat of war.

Editorial Office: Admiral, you presumably awaited the news from Moscow with particular impatience. After all, it was your organization that, more than 1 year ago, urged the U.S. and USSR Governments to halt nuclear tests...

LaRocque: Yes, the Center for Defense Information has a double reason to be glad at the Soviet leadership's decision to extend the moratorium to 1 January 1987. Of course, it would be better if the Reagan administration were to follow your example. As a professional military man, I wholly share M.S. Gorbachev's opinion that in a world that already has too many weapons, their further stockpiling is senseless: No power is now able to ensure its own security independently and the only thing that increases as stocks of bombs and missiles increase is the risk of the destruction of all life on earth.

Was I surprised by the reaction of the White House, which again rejected out of hand the Soviet proposal to take the first step toward curtailing the arms race -- that is, the ending of nuclear tests? Unfortunately, no. No matter what Reagan and officials from his entourage say about their desire to achieve the complete elimination of nuclear missiles, their true intentions, which, incidentally, even the White House itself sometimes openly states, amount to the creation of new means of mass destruction, including in space.

Milshteyn: By refusing to join the moratorium, the Reagan administration IS PURSUING THE ILLUSION [capitalized passage published in boldface] of attaining military superiority over the Soviet Union. Otherwise Washington would not limit itself to statements that nuclear war must not be launched and cannot be won. But meanwhile the tests in Nevada continue, because the work to create combat lasers and new warheads for Tridents, the MX system, and cruise missiles is continuing.

The fundamental difference between the USSR and U.S. approach to questions of the moratorium is clear to literally everyone. The Soviet Government's decision to continue to refrain from testing resulted from a scrupulous analysis of the situation. In so doing we deliberately incurred costs, since during the moratorium's term of operation so far the United States has conducted a further 18 tests in addition to its existing considerable advantage in numbers of nuclear tests. The main thing for us is to facilitate the Geneva disarmament talks as much as possible, to get them moving, and thereby to resume the arms limitation process. Washington's answer to Moscow was again "no!" and was blurted out with unseemly haste, even though all parts of M.S. Gorbachev's statement are worthy of careful study.

Editorial Office: Furthermore, this is not the first time that the Reagan administration has presumed to speak for its allies. In this way, it seems, the White House is trying to prevent dissent in the NATO camp. A typical example of the imperial form of conduct!

Milshteyn: Absolutely correct. But today only London displays a readiness to meekly align with Washington. Even in the statements of some FRG officials you can hear support for our decision.

Editorial Office: Thus the USSR's efforts are not in vain and our unilateral moratorium is not pointless?

LaRocque: I have no right to give advice to your government and people. But, as a true patriot, I want to state with the utmost conviction that the Soviet leadership's decision to continue to refrain from tests meets the supreme interests of all countries, including the United States. It is not without reason that the feelings of my fellow-countrymen are changing right before my eyes. More and more Americans are coming to believe in the sincerity of the USSR's desire to end the nuclear arms race and reach appropriate international agreements.

For that reason the Reagan administration is finding it increasingly difficult to go on with the explosions in Nevada: Each new test of this kind reminds people that silence has long reigned at your nuclear test ranges. Hence the increasingly loud appeals to the White House to take the Soviet proposals seriously. This is also demonstrated by the reaction of the people who have recently contacted our center.

Milshteyn: The Washington administration is acting contrary to the feelings of the masses. When I took part in the recent peace cruise on the Mississippi, I saw for myself once more how great the desire for peace is among ordinary Americans.

LaRocque: In that sense the changes on Capitol Hill are particularly remarkable. Congress, which until recently rubber-stamped the administration's military programs, is increasingly often advocating their reduction, sometimes even their complete curtailment. This applied to the plans for the creation [sozdaniye] of space weapons and new types of chemical weapons, was expressed in the legislators' demands for a considerable cut -- more than 10 percent -- in the overall amount of military spending requested by the White House, and was reflected in a resolution banning further nuclear arms tests.

Editorial Office: Despite all that, how does the Reagan administration hope to go on misleading the U.S. and world public?

Milshteyn: By using all the same old pseudoarguments Washington used to justify its reaction to M.S. Gorbachev's statement. In part old hackneyed cliches, in part recently devised theses. There is also the attempt to portray the Soviet proposals as pure propaganda, allusions to the need to anticipate future agreements with a strict system of verification [proverka], claims that when the moratorium was announced the USSR had already carried out all the tests it needed and did not need any more, and arguments about U.S. national security and that of its NATO allies, which, it is claimed, would suffer from the ending of the explosions in Nevada.

None of these arguments stands up even to elementary criticism. Adm LaRocque has already mentioned the fact that true concern for national security is incompatible with an unrestrained arms race. Many other U.S. experts are of the same opinion. While constantly talking about monitoring [kontrol] and verification [proverka], the Reagan administration has so far said nothing intelligible about what it specifically has in mind or on what terms it would agree to ban nuclear tests. The Soviet Union by its actions has shown its goodwill on this question, by allowing U.S. specialists to visit the Semipalatinsk region, where our tests were carried out prior to the moratorium, and to install their scientific equipment there to record seismic disturbances. So to all intents and purposes the verification [proverka] of the cessation of tests is already being carried out in our country. Washington, however, invites Soviet scientists to Nevada to monitor [kontrolirovat] the course of explosions continuing there.

LaRocque: If anyone is engaging in propaganda, and crude and dishonest propaganda, it is the Reagan administration. For example, how can it seriously be claimed that the United States needs to overtake the USSR in the number of tests, when it is common knowledge that even at the time the moratorium was announced the Soviet side had conducted over 200 fewer nuclear explosions! References to the problem of monitoring [kontrol] are simply grating. They are particularly inappropriate now, when your country, demonstrating honesty and an interest in ending nuclear tests as soon as possible, has offered our experts the opportunity to monitor in person the situation in the region where your nuclear tests were conducted prior to 1 August 1985.

Editorial Office: In his 18 August statement, M.S. Gorbachev proposed that a second meeting with President Reagan deal with specifics: that is be crowned by the signing of an agreement on the ending of nuclear tests...

Milshteyn: A very timely and valuable proposal. All the people of the world, including the Soviet and the American people, would welcome a new summit, since they pin great hopes on it. It goes without saying here that such a meeting should not be reduced to a simple exchange of opinions. If, as Mikail Sergeyevich has proposed, a summit were held and culminated in the signing of an agreement on the ending of nuclear tests, that event would go down in history as a turning point of Soviet-U.S. relations and the disarmament movement. Furthermore, such a meeting would represent the practical embodiment of the commitments President Reagan and the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee assumed in Geneva last November. Unfortunately, so far you have to talk about this in hypothetical terms because the White House has not shown any interest in a constructive continuation of the dialogue begun in Geneva. Instead, the Washington administration is spurring on the arms race and heading toward a further fueling of international tension, undermining the arms limitation agreements that have been concluded in previous years. That is how Washington is preparing for a new summit.



Benefits of Joint Ban Viewed

PM261132 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Aug 86 Morning Edition p 4

[I. Zakharov article: "Obvious Advantages. The Termination of Nuclear Explosions -- A Way Toward Improving the International Situation"]

[Text] The Soviet Union's decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions until 1 January 1987 has encountered broad approval on all continents. All honest people on the planet place a high value on the prolonged silence at Soviet nuclear tests sites and on our new initiative, which demonstrates the USSR's commitment to the policy of peace.

But there are also people, particularly among transatlantic figures, who, in a display of feigned naivety, pretend to be at a loss: Why should the Russians attach such great importance to such an insignificant issue at the termination of nuclear tests? The hypocrisy of this naivety is obvious. Such reasoning can be expected only from those who do not understand, or rather are unwilling to understand, the realities of the nuclear and space age, from those who deliberately oppose the solution of the foremost problem of our time -- the termination of the arms race and the elimination of nuclear weapons on earth.

The Soviet Union is profoundly convinced that the termination of nuclear explosions would constitute a true breakthrough toward halting the nuclear arms race and would create conditions for the elimination of nuclear weapons. This belief is based on an in-depth analysis of the influence of the effect of nuclear tests on the development [razvitiye] of technical means to wage war, on people and the environment, and on the climate of the international situation as a whole.

From the military-technical viewpoint, the importance of a nuclear test ban is determined by the position tests occupy in the process of the development [razrabotka] of new varieties and types of mass destruction weapons. It can be said without any exaggeration that nuclear tests play a determining role in the creation [sozdaniye] of new weapons.

This is because nuclear tests, regardless of their yield, are an integral part of programs for the creation [sozdaniye] of any new nuclear charges or the modernization of obsolescent ones, be they warheads for ICBM's, SLBM's, or cruise missiles or nuclear charges for aviation bombs. It is no accident that the entire series of nuclear explosions conducted at the test site in Nevada while the Soviet unilateral moratorium has been in effect was meant for the development [razrabotka] of nuclear charges for strategic missiles being developed [razrabatyvayemyy] under the MX, Midgetman, and Trident programs.

The last few years have seen a sharp increase in the dangerous role of nuclear tests in connection with the "Strategic Defense Initiative"--the so-called "star wars" program--which has been announced in the United States.



The creation [sozdaniye] of space-strike means, and primarily of the nuclear-pumped laser, considered in the United States to be one of their most promising components, is impossible without the detailed testing [otrabotka] of this device's nuclear part, in other words without nuclear explosions. The fatal nature of SDI for mankind's peaceful development and for the stability of the strategic situation has been repeatedly and convincingly proved by both Soviet and foreign scientists, politicians, and military figures. The direct link between nuclear explosions and the "star wars" program and other plans for creation [sozdaniye] of "third generation" weapons provides incontrovertible proof that the continuation of explosions is aimed at whipping up the arms race and at an unrestricted nuclear escalation.

Indeed, the very process of the improvement and development [sovershenstvovaniye i razrobotka] of more and more new types of mass destruction weapons, a process linked with nuclear tests, poses the threat of unpredictable effect on the environment and on man. No matter how much the U.S. Administration may cover up instances of accidents or loss of control over projects being tested, no matter how much it may praise the reliability of the safety measures being taken, there always is and always will be a chance of unforeseen behavior by the device being exploded. There is no need to search far for examples. Deadly radioactive pollution occurred and serious complications developed recently during an explosion in Nevada conducted under the codename "Mighty Oak." The externally "insignificant" effects of nuclear tests on man have also acquired a permanent nature. According to data from the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, leukemia incidence has increased by 60 percent in regions adjoining some U.S. nuclear centers. A nuclear test ban would rule out the possibility of such cases developing and would contribute much to the prevention of further environmental pollution.

It is impossible to overestimate the political importance of the United States' joining our moratorium on nuclear explosions. Were the USSR proposal accepted, the benefits of such a step for the cause of peace would be enormous. The main benefit would be the display of readiness to abandon the course of nuclear escalation, which is threatening to run totally out of control, a readiness to switch the course of international development along the tracks of detente.

The United States' joining in the moratorium on nuclear explosions would have a positive effect on the solution of a wide range of practical problems of bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations.

First, the question of halting tests is an essential part of the Soviet nuclear disarmament program but, at the same time, it can be solved quite independently and quickly. Independently and quickly, of course, subject to a reciprocal willingness by the United States.

Second, given the apparently limited nature of this measure (compared with the problem of nuclear disarmament as a whole), it is the simplest, most realistic, and most effective step toward terminating the nuclear arms race. It does not demand lengthy consultations or discussions. Its adoption would help nuclear arsenals become obsolescent and immobilized [omertvleniye] as a result of the termination of the modernization and improvement of the relevant weapons.

Third, a nuclear test ban in the form of a proper treaty would become a prologue to progress at the current Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms, would open the way for the elaboration of accords and treaties in the broad sphere of disarmament, and would help the fundamental improvement of the international climate. It would introduce the elements of trust that are so necessary and lacking to such an extent in current USSR-U.S. relations.

Millions and millions of people in all countries acclaim and approve the USSR's decision to extend the term of the moratorium on nuclear explosions. There must be an end to nuclear explosions on earth. Not only must this be done, it actually can be done. The problem of a ban on nuclear explosions has been studied and elaborated in greater detail than any other disarmament question. From the technical viewpoint, this is a simple step that can be taken quickly and effectively. The verification [kontrol] of compliance with pledges to terminate nuclear explosions can be carried out with the help of just national technical means, not to mention by using international verification [proverka] up to on-site inspection [inspektsiya], as proposed by the Soviet Union.

Now it is a matter of the U.S. leadership's political will. The question is whether it will prove capable of new political thinking. The people in the world hope so.

#### 'Giving U.S. Time To Reflect'

PM261338 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 21 Aug 86 p 3

[G. Dadyants "Observer's Notes": "Why We are extending the Moratorium"]

[Text] For more than a year now Soviet nuclear test grounds have been silent. The USSR is not conducting any nuclear explosions -- for either military or peaceful purposes. Three times it has extended the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests, introduced on 6 August 1985, and now it has extended it again.

The statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on Soviet television is not just another manifestation of the Soviet Union's goodwill. The decision to extend the moratorium until 1 January 1987 is also a manifestation of new political thinking and of profound understanding of the realities of the nuclear-space age. It is an example of how we must act in the present complex and extremely dangerous international situation.

In today's world whole mountains of mass destruction weapons have been accumulated -- so many nuclear weapons alone have been stockpiled that our planet could be destroyed several times over. Nevertheless, the arms race is not slowing down but is increasing its pace. The militarization of the United States and the entire NATO bloc is proceeding at a faster pace on all fronts. The rate at which military technology is developing is so high that politicians are left with less and less time to realize the danger posed to mankind by this technology.

But this danger is becoming increasingly formidable. In a situation of nuclear confrontation and the constant improvement of mass destruction weapons, even the "balance of fear," on which, so Western politicians believe, postwar peace has been based, is ceasing to be a deterrent factor. Fear merely intensifies mistrust and suspicion. A vicious circle of the buildup of international tension is taking shape. It is perfectly obvious that a continued nuclear arms race and its spread to outer space make a nuclear catastrophe still more likely.

In his statement M.S. Grobachev mentioned two tragedies connected with the technology of the nuclear-space age: the deaths of the crew aboard the American space shuttle "Challenger" and the accident at the Chernobyl AES. These events gave an object lesson in what would happen if nuclear weapons were to be used. Scientists calculate that the explosion of the smallest clear warhead would be equal to three Chernobyls in terms of radiation strength. Now it does not even matter who carries out the notorious "first strike" and who the "counterstrike." The paradox of the nuclear age is that one can die from the effects of one's own warheads being detonated.

Why has the ending of nuclear tests today developed into a key problem of international politics? Because virtually all problems connected with disarmament and the future of the arms race are bound up in this one issue. After all, without nuclear tests it is impossible either to improve or to create new types of nuclear weapons. Ending tests means getting the entire disarmament process moving, while continuing them is equivalent to giving the "green light" to the creation of new arms systems so sophisticated as to be unstoppable.

It is on understanding of this obvious truth that our complicated, extremely responsible, and, to be blunt, difficult decision to again extend our moratorium is based.

It is well-known that the United States still refuses to join our moratorium -- we cannot turn a blind eye to this. What is more, during the period the Soviet moratorium has been in effect, the United States has conducted 15 officially announced and another 3 unannounced nuclear explosions in Nevada. This has been done in a provocatively blatant way -- each new explosion has been timed to coincide either with another of our statements on extending the moratorium or with a new Soviet peace initiative. The American hawks have not been deterred either by appeals to heed the voice of reason or by numerous protests throughout the world, including in the United States itself, against the continuation of nuclear tests.

The flimsiest arguments have been put forward in this connection. It has been claimed, for example, that the United States is seriously "lagging behind" the Soviet Union regarding nuclear tests, although statistics show directly the opposite. There have been references to the fact that it is impossible to establish effective monitoring of nuclear tests -- although the USSR has proposed introducing all forms of verification [kontrol], from national to international, right up to on-site inspection [inspectsii na mestakh]. Even now, when the USSR has agreed to the installation of American monitoring equipment in the semipalatinsk region, when we have located by national means three "secret" American explosions, and when it has become clear once and for all that the problem of verification [kontrol] is no obstacle to ending nuclear tests, it is still exploited in an attempt to cancel a true reluctance to disarm.

As recently as 16 August, after the U.S. House of Representatives voted to end all nuclear tests with a yield in excess of 1 kiloton, President Regan assured Americans in his radio address that this decision "will end" U.S. security and the reliability of the American "deterrence potential."

The real reason for the Reagan administration's reluctance to join the Soviet moratorium is by no means concern for its "deterrence potential." The U.S. military-industrial complex is crazy about the nuclear arms race in the full sense of the word. The 18 nuclear tests in Nevada were required for the creation of new Trident-2 and Midgetmen missile warheads and also for the "star wars" program -- the testing of nuclear-powered x-ray lasers. Of course, Washington's refusal to join the Soviet moratorium is also connected with other aspects of the American Administration's foreign policy course -- its general gamble on resolving world problems by force, its so-called policy of "neoglobalism," and its desire to secure commanding positions in the world. A large part is played by hopes of exhausting the Soviet Union economically, imposing a new round of the nuclear arms race on us, and thereby impeding the implementation of the large-scale plans for the Soviet Union's social and economic development outlined by the 27th CPSU Congress. In other words, the U.S. continuation of nuclear tests serves not only purely military aims but also economic and political ones.

Of course, when it introduced its moratorium on nuclear explosions on 6 August 1985 the Soviet Union entertained no illusions regarding American imperialism and its policies. As M.S. Gorbachev noted, we know who we are dealing with. We also know this today, when we are extending our moratorium for another few months. But the Soviet Union cannot do otherwise. Our decision on the moratorium has been founded and continues to be founded on socialism's commitment as a social system to the cause of peace and on its thorough understanding of its responsibility for the fate of human civilization. The USSR -- both as a socialist state and as a nuclear power -- considers it to be its lofty duty to do everything possible to preserve a peaceful future for the world. The Soviet moratorium proves in practice the seriousness and sincerity of our nuclear disarmament program and our calls for a new policy -- a policy of realism, peace, and cooperation. On behalf of the Soviet people M.S. Gorbachev has appealed to Americans' reason and dignity not to miss another historic chance on the road to ending the arms race, and to President Reagan to impartially reassess the present situation, jettison all superficialities, and overcome delusions regarding the Soviet Union and its foreign policy.

Basically, by once again extending the moratorium, we are giving the U.S. Administration extra time to reflect. Let Washington think about the impasse into which its adventurist, militarist policy could lead the world. The Soviet Union is sure that an agreement on ending nuclear tests could be reached quickly and signed this very year at a Soviet-American summit meeting. One would like to hope that what will prevail in U.S. assessments and actions will be not the interests of the military-industrial complex but the interests of the American people -- their understanding of the need for a joint quest with the Soviet Union for ways to ending the senseless arms race and eliminating the most dangerous enemy of contemporary human civilization -- nuclear weapons.

#### U.S. Arguments Rebutted

AU251556 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 22 Aug 86 p 7

[Article by Spartak Beglov, APN political observer, "specially for RABOTNICHESKO DELO": "Is What Is Good for the Soviet Union Bad for the United States?"]

[Text] When he announced the new extension of the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests until 1 January 1987, Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, called upon the U.S. Administration to show its readiness to sign at an early date a nuclear test ban agreement.

At the same time, it becomes clear from the Soviet leader's declaration that he is taking fully into account the fact that forces that do not want to disarm at all are actively at work in the United States. All the same, Moscow is not giving up the efforts to influence Washington by the force of arguments and reason. Moscow stresses that no decisions of a military nature can be justified from the viewpoint of U.S. security, and voices the hope that realism will prevail in the U.S. assessments and actions.

Many facts about U.S. policy prove how necessary and topical this appeal is. Particular alarm -- not only on the Soviet side, but also among many worried Americans -- is being raised by the obviously falsified assessments the U.S. Administration persists in using as grounds for the decisions in its military and foreign policy strategy. A fresh example is the U.S. President's recent radio address on 16 August. On this occasion he sharply criticized the version of the bill for the 1987 military budget approved by the U.S. House of Representatives. Let us recall that the matter at issue was those points in the bill that preserve the ban on the testing of antisatellite weapons, deny funds for the production of binary gases, freeze expenditure on the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI), block the President's attempts to undermine SALT II, and propose a halt to all nuclear tests with a force exceeding 1 kiloton.

It is too little to say that the President's address -- in striking contrast to Mikhail Gorbachev's declaration -- is permeated with the confrontational approach, according to which every argument in favor of continuing the senseless arms race is built on the premise that "what is good for the USSR is bad for the United States."

Still worse is the fact that, in order to provide grounds for the official policy, directed at destroying the foundations of society and arms control, a concentrated blend of insinuations and fabrications is being utilized regarding the Soviet Union's acts and intentions. "The Soviet Union," the aforementioned address asserts, "has had antimissile weapons at its disposal for a long time." However, the truth is that several years ago the USSR proposed not only banning, but even destroying the antimissile systems, and then declared a unilateral moratorium on their testing and deployment. According to the version put out by the U.S. President, the USSR "has been working for decades on its strategic defense and is making advances to the detriment of the United States." But those in the United States who are acquainted with the issue are well aware that the Soviet Union has never conducted any work in the field of "strategic defense," as it is conceived in the United States, and has developed no program for the design of space-based strike weapons.

In its attempts to discredit the idea of the nuclear test moratorium, Washington is resorting to the version that as far back as 1958, when the United States agreed to a similar moratorium, "the Russians unilaterally contravened it." But the truth of the matter is this. According to the evidence of U.S. Vice Admiral Eugene Carroll, published in THE NEW YORK TIMES on 7 August 1985: "The administration claims that Moscow is supposed to have contravened the last (joint) nuclear test moratorium in 1961. This is a lie. At that time no moratorium was in existence. In December 1959, President Eisenhower suspended the moratorium of 1958 when he announced that America considered itself within its rights to resume testing." Just as "plausible" are the assertions (repeated once again by the President) that the USSR had allegedly achieved a great superiority over the United States, by "suddenly" resuming testing in September 1961. Here is what the U.S. vice admiral has to say on this issue: "This is also a lie. From 1 September 1961 until the cessation of testing in the atmosphere on 5 August 1963, the United States was ahead of the USSR by a ratio of 2:1."

Despite all this, the President accused the congressmen of "irresponsibility" regarding the country's national defense.

If such actions are permitted in the eyes of the administration regarding the "ambassadors of the people" in the United States, it is not hard to imagine the whole complexity of the position of the Soviet representatives when the American side greets them at the negotiations with the wall of falsehood.

In Geneva in November 1985, it seemed that the U.S. leadership was on the verge of acknowledging the truth that there can be no victors either in a nuclear war or in the arms race. But when the moment came for this idea to be given concrete form, the inertia of the old way of thinking and acting gained the upper hand. In its abandonment of SALT II, as well as in its adherence to the SDI program and its continuation of nuclear testing, the White House demonstrates how strong the illusion is among certain circles that the worse it is for the Soviet Union, the better it is for America.

The issue of halting of nuclear testing has become a starting point for further improving international security. The same is true for the prospect of the new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. The agreement to ban these tests might turn out to be the chief result of this summit. Not only the Soviet Union, but also a substantial, most authoritative, section of world public opinion is giving Washington to understand that it cannot guarantee its own security while it ignores the security of the other states and peoples. What is good for the Soviet Union and the rest of the world is also good for the United States.

#### U.S. 'Puts Cart Before Horse'

LD221634 Moscow TASS in English 1614 GMT 22 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 22 TASS -- Follows commentary by Boris Shabayev, TASS political news analyst:

On these days, the world could see particularly clearly two different lines, two approaches to the international security problem. The one to which the Soviet Union is firmly committed is that it takes major practical steps to put an end to the weapons race. And the most urgent such step is renunciation of continuing nuclear tests, to which the USSR has unilaterally adhered for more than a year now. This approach meets with understanding and support from a considerable and authoritative part of the world community. A different attitude is demonstrated by the U.S. right-wing, militaristic grouping. Upholding the interests of the powerful military-industrial complex this grouping is simply obsessed with the weapons race. Official Washington is stubbornly disregarding the present-day realities and continues banking on ensuring military superiority, on power methods of resolving the world problems. But why an end to nuclear testing has today become one of the key international issues, the historical touchstone for the maturity of these two policy lines? Because practically all burning problems are tied here in a tight (?knot. Mankind's future depends on how) these problems are resolved. If an end is put to nuclear blasts, and the USA, in the first place, follows the Soviet Union's example, it will become impossible to create new, even more perfect types of nuclear weapons. This will put an end to the process of mankind's slipping into the abyss of a thermonuclear catastrophe.

And, on the (?contrary), continuing nuclear tests means giving a "green light" to the appearance of such sophisticated weapons systems that will be impossible to keep under control in general. At last, the mutual and controlled end to nuclear testing is a

specific step towards (?creating) an atmosphere of detente and trust, without which it is difficult in general to speak of reaching serious agreements in any field. It might seem that is all so obvious that there can be no doubt on that score. Yet, the forces in Washington which make decisions on the policy of the United States are of a different opinion.

They believe that the question of a ban on nuclear testing may arise only when a broad, deep and verifiable cut in arms is achieved, and verification opportunities are bettered and steps are made towards building up trust. Washington is unable to give an answer to the simple question of how it is possible to advance on the way towards achieving these aims, without making even the first step. Washington cannot give an answer, since it puts the cart before the horse. But with such a method of harnessing, the cart will not start moving.

### USSR Will 'Ensure Security'

PM251233 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Aug 86 First Edition p 3

["Specialist's commentary" by Colonel General N. Chervov: "Our Firm Will"]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev's statement made an in-depth analysis of the contemporary world situation and concretized the principled tenets of our party's foreign policy elaborated at the 27th Congress. The statement is concrete proof of new political thinking, of a new approach to the problems of war and peace, of ensuring world security, and of strengthening the country's defense. It marks an important new state in the struggle of the Soviet people and the world's progressive public for the total cessation of nuclear tests, the elimination of nuclear weapons, and the improvement of international relations.

The decision to extend the moratorium confirms the earnest and sincere nature of our nuclear disarmament program. It was a difficult matter for us to make that decision, particularly in the military respect. But the CPSU did so, aware that the political benefit from such a step greatly exceeds all other considerations.

In a certain sense our decision puts the U.S. Administration on the defensive.

It tests the sincerity of the White House's approach to the problem of reducing nuclear arms and the U.S. Administration's ability to rise above its narrow mercenary interests. As is known, the White House at once -- literally the same day -- rejected any possibility of subscribing to the Soviet moratorium. The U.S. rejection of the moratorium compromises Washington's entire policy, as well as the policy of NATO as a military alliance that proclaims defense as its aim while in fact building up military preparations for aggression.

This must be reckoned with. The statement emphasized that we evaluate the situation soberly and know who we are dealing with. The country's security is a sacred matter for us. "This," as M.S. Gorbachev pointed out, "must be clear to everyone. It is a matter of principle."

The Soviet Union has the forces and means to reliably ensure the security of the country and of our allies in the face of any U.S. aggressive actions. Our love of



peace is not a consequence of weakness but the result of our confidence in our own strength and potential and in the correctness of our chosen political course, which is unanimously supported by the entire Soviet people and by Army and Navy servicemen.

All kinds of falsehoods are being disseminated in the West in connection with the moratorium extension for the sole purpose of belittling the significance of our major practical step on the road to disarmament. The U.S. leaders claim, for example, that America is lagging behind the USSR and therefore must continue nuclear tests. However, such statements do not correspond to reality. The facts indicate that the United States is the champion regarding the number of explosions. It has carried out more nuclear explosions than all the nuclear powers put together. It has carried out roughly one-third more nuclear explosions than the Soviet Union.

At the same time, the United States has carried out more nuclear explosions in each individual environment (in the atmosphere, under ground, and under water). If we take just the past 2 years, the picture looks like this. In 1984, the sides carried out roughly equal numbers of nuclear weapon tests. In 1985, the United States carried out approximately 20 explosions, while the USSR, prior to the moratorium, conducted 9, of which 2 were for peaceful purposes. During the year of the Soviet moratorium the United States exploded 18 nuclear devices. These are the statistics. As you see, there is no question of any U.S. lag. Therefore, those who say that there is would really like the United States to retain the possibility of improving and creating [sozdaniye] new types of nuclear weapons and, thus, to continue the arms race.

The real reason for the U.S. Administration's reluctance to renounce nuclear explosions lies in the U.S. desire to upset in its favor the established equilibrium of forces. This is the purpose of the program to create [sozdaniye] various kinds of nuclear charges for space-strike arms under the "star wars" plan, as well as new kinds of weapons (MX, Trident 2, and Midgetman strategic missiles). There simply are no other reasons.

In addition, Western propaganda uses an unscrupulous method in connection with the moratorium -- the insinuation is being spread, for example, that the Soviet military allegedly disagrees with the CPSU decisions in the sphere of disarmament and security, particularly regarding taking unilateral measures. What can be said about this? This is, of course, an attempt to pass off what is desired as something real. There has been and is nothing of the sort.

Here, in the Soviet Union, the unified Communist Party is the leading and directing force of our society.

Military people are full and equal members of the CPSU, have a unified Marxist-Leninist world outlook, and are of like mind in solving military-political problems and in matters of military building. This does not mean that we do not have different opinions and views on these complex issues. But this is an internal matter for us. The desire of certain circles in the West to find some kind of "chinks" between the Soviet political leadership and military leadership is, quite frankly, a futile waste of time.

M.S. Gorbachev's statement and the Soviet Union's new political initiatives give Soviet servicemen still greater confidence. The decision of our party and government to extend the moratorium enhances the Soviet Armed Forces' responsibility for ensuring reliable defense and demands the further enhancement of vigilance and combat and mobilization readiness.



The Communist Party and the Soviet Government entrust to us military people something of tremendous importance, on which the security of the Soviet people's peaceful labor and the possibility of successfully implementing the great plans for communist building outlined by the 27th CPSU Congress depend. It is the duty of Soviet servicemen to justify this trust and to do everything to ensure that the tasks set us are fulfilled!

#### PRAVDA Weekly Review

PM251311 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Aug 86 First Edition p 4

[Yevgeniy Grigoryev "International Review"]

[Text] PRAVDA's teletype room has been overloaded with work this week. Usually in August, at the peak of the vacation season, the foreign news tapes become shorter. But this year more and more rolls of tape had to be fed in: It is no exaggeration to say that a tremendous stream of responses, comments, and opinions was (and still is) coming in in connection with the statement delivered by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on 18 August.

#### The Main Event

The statement immediately gave a powerful boost to the discussion of one of the key problems of international policy, the struggle of opinions and political and social forces on the question of whether or not there should be an end to nuclear tests and thus a change for the better in the world situation.

The world awaited the Soviet leader's words with great impatience and interest. The Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions expired 6 August. It lasted a whole year, although Washington was acting provocatively and refusing to follow our example. How would the Soviet Union act? That question interested everyone, including those who were and are exploding nuclear devices at the Nevada range. But above all, it was of sincere concern to hundreds of millions of people and sensible political forces, who hoped that Moscow would offer yet another chance for those who are moving toward nuclear catastrophe to come to their senses.

The peoples' expectations were not disappointed. Hence the positive and generally grateful echo in response to the Soviet Union's decision to extend its unilateral moratorium until 1 January 1987. And to its appeal rapidly to reach and sign an agreement on ending nuclear tests this year.

Yes, many governments and influential political and public circles assess our new initiative highly. It is described as an important practical contribution to the cause of peace. It is said to be an example of reasonable, worthy, constructive, responsible behavior by a great power in the complex international conditions that prevail, conditions in which tension carves out dangerous areas of confrontation. There is an increased awareness that banning nuclear tests is not an end in itself, but a promising, effective lever for resolving disarmament problems and leading the world out of the impasse of the arms race in general.

Judging from the responses, there is a relatively wide "consensus" that questions of verifying that tests are not being conducted are virtually resolved in technical terms

(this is indicated, in particular, in a special report of the UN secretary general published the other day). Therefore in the future it will be more difficult for Washington to endlessly speculate on the supposed impossibility of "verification." The aforementioned opinions are voiced by the leaders of states of different alliance orientations and by representatives of, not infrequently, opposing political and social forces.

The fraternal socialist states regard the new Soviet initiative as an integral part of our countries' joint line in world affairs. Poland's TRYBUNA LUDU writes: "If it was not for the negative position of the U.S. Administration, the whole world would have been free from nuclear tests from last August, from the moment of the first Soviet moratorium.

Silence on the testing ranges would certainly have helped resolve urgent problems." You could not put it more clearly than that.

Of course, we are interested to know what people in the capital of our great Chinese neighbor think about this problem. In answer to this question, a PRC Foreign Ministry spokesman said: "We believe that nuclear tests are not a completely isolated question. In order to achieve effective nuclear disarmament, we advocate that the two largest nuclear powers first and foremost stop the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons, and also considerably reduce their nuclear arms."

The Soviet step was greeted with great satisfaction in the "Delhi Six" countries. The Japanese Foreign Ministry responded positively to the extension of the moratorium. "This initiative cannot be overestimated," W. Brandt, chairman of the Soviet Democratic Party of Germany, stated. Its great significance was noted by Senator E. Kennedy. In Paris, the newspaper LE MONDE stressed the goodwill reflected in this step by the Soviet Union. A representative of the British Labor Party said: "No justification remains either for Britain or for the United States. The world awaits a comprehensive test ban, and summit meetings are a suitable opportunity."

All this speaks for itself. These opinions are indeed widespread on the planet. Our new initiative undoubtedly reinforces them. It also reinforces the will of peace-loving forces and antiwar movements to take united action to achieve a realistic goal.

But let us not deceive ourselves. Excessive optimism is, by all appearances, inappropriate. There are "responses" of another kind too. There is still great resistance to the ending of the arms race in the U.S. Administration and the mighty military-industrial complex. As yet there has been no official response from Washington to the Soviet appeal. But after initial confusion, officials of that administration have clearly been trying to minimize and discredit the Soviet initiative and justify their own course of continuing the arms race.

#### Unseemly Maneuvers

The moment of truth has once again arrived for Washington. "Throughout the world, support is growing for an agreement on ending nuclear tests," NBC television commentator J. Chancellor says. THE WASHINGTON POST groans in annoyance about the "unseemly spectacle of the administration being dragged kicking and screaming to talks on a treaty on a comprehensive nuclear weapon test ban." Yes, many observers on both sides of the Atlantic and the Pacific cannot help noting the fact that the White House has found itself in a difficult position: It has nowhere to hide, as the saying goes.

We are not likely to feel sorry about that. But as London's THE GUARDIAN correctly suggested, "to say that the USSR has secured a propaganda victory is to belittle the significance of such a moratorium." It would be far better if the United States responded with a similar propaganda victory" by doing a similar thing, that is, stopping nuclear explosions. However, since its ruling circles do not want that, they are now having to let themselves go completely.

Their methods here are not marked by originality: Propaganda tricks and ruses up to and including outright lies, distorting the content, meaning, and objectives of the USSR's proposals, and trying to conceal them from the main bulk of the population. More cunning maneuvers are also being undertaken. The task here is to justify the principle of continuing nuclear explosions, mislead people of goodwill and the antinuclear movement, and present the administration in the role of all but a champion of nuclear disarmament.

There is no lack of shamelessness here. At the beginning of the week, representatives of the American Administration rejected the proposals contained in the Soviet statement without even having read the complete text, let alone studied it. But what do we hear at the end of the week from Santa Barbara, where some of the White House staff are staying with the President? The leader of that staff calls for a "well thought out answer, not a rapid rejection." But he is not talking about the moratorium. Reprimanding the American mass media on the grounds that the majority of them "pay attention only to what is happening in the arms control sphere," this official tried to bring them back to what is familiar letter, which was the subject of propagandist publicity back in early August and whose content, according to the logic of the above remark, does not relate particularly to the "arms control sphere." In connection with the USSR's proposals, people in Santa Barbara feigned "disappointment": They say that these "do not go into concrete details." Of course, the leader of the White House staff is very well aware that there could be no more concrete proposal: to reach agreement on a nuclear test ban, rapidly to draw up a corresponding agreement, and to sign it this year at the Soviet-American summit meeting. It is another matter that Washington would like to erode people's idea of what is really being proposed.

The administration's key "counterargument" has been repeated often this week. It proclaims that "a moratorium does not accord with the security interests of the United States or its allies and friends." So, security on nuclear powder kegs, when the explosion of even a small part of them would become an irremediable catastrophe? That is an absurdity not subject to the rules of logic! But nonetheless it is put into circulation, by people who have not even asked the opinion of their allies.

Yet FRG Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher, for instance, stated: "If an accord on a comprehensive test ban is reached at the summit meeting, we would only welcome that fact." Spain has responded positively to the USSR's decision. The Netherlands Foreign Ministry noted that "the USSR's new peace initiative merits a high appraisal." According to REUTERS, "Norway, Denmark, and Greece were among those allies that did not agree with U.S. views on the question of a comprehensive test ban." These facts speak for themselves.

Of course, Washington takes account of the fact that the administration's negative attitude toward a moratorium is alarming millions of people in the United States itself. Simple logic tells them: If there are no tests, there will be no improvement of nuclear arms and the path to their elimination will be opened up. According to a poll, some 80 percent of Americans would like nuclear explosions to stop in Nevada, and, incidentally, throughout the world. Therefore, in order to reassure and disorient the public, a kind

of "cheerful bluff" is being practised. They are trying to create the impression in people, through the press, that Washington is not "Mister No," that "new ideas" are maturing deep within the administration and that while rejecting the proposal on ending tests, people there are "expressing restrained optimism regarding the possibility of concluding an agreement at other talks," and so on, and so forth.

So what are these "new ideas"? Some of them have already been thrown to the American press. For instance, the "idea" of some kind of ersatz limitation on the number of tests, instead of their complete end. They are also talking about "the administration's readiness to join with the Soviet Union in a new attempt to elaborate the technology of compliance with a ban on nuclear explosions." But not to join in a total ban on the explosions themselves.

But whatever maneuvers people across the ocean may make, the attitude toward our new initiative remains the touchstone of sincerity and responsibility on the part of the American leaders. There is no escaping the fact that -- we quote THE NEW YORK TIMES -- "in the public's opinion, nuclear tests are synonymous with the arms race." That cannot be proved wrong!

### Roots of Obstruction

The latest stage of the "Red Flag" exercises has been taking place in recent days at Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada. American planes are engaging in "combat" with fighters bearing the red star and making strikes against "enemy" units clad in military uniform similar to ours and marching under the red flag. "All this gives the exercises credibility and reminds us who is our enemy," Air Force Captain Gary West explained to THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.

So on one hand they give public assurances of their desire for every possible contact with the Soviet Union and for a new summit meeting, and on the other they set their fighters on to make war on us. How is that compatible with the Soviet-American statement in Geneva that there must be no war between the USSR and the United States -- either conventional or nuclear? But it is not for the sake of pure eloquence that the magazine DER SPIEGEL writes in its August issue: "Despite all denials, American strategists are preparing for the waging and the consequences of a prolonged nuclear war." And the journal cites facts.

During these days the MX first-strike ICBM's have begun to be put in place. General L. Welch, the new U.S. Air Force chief of staff, presented the news, "at breakfast" with reporters in the Pentagon, that the modernization of the 131st B-52 bomber has begun, to enable it to carry cruise missiles. In other words, they are methodically working toward breaking the limits imposed under SALT II. Judging from a statement by D. Feith, deputy assistant secretary of defense on negotiations policy, the Pentagon is also shrugging aside the convention on banning biological and toxic weapons, which supposedly "has major shortcomings and cannot be rectified." Extolling this savage method as a "great weapon," D. Feith stressed ominously: "We have changed our opinion about the military usefulness of bacteriological weapons."

The militarist group that represents the mighty U.S. military-industrial complex is simply crazy about the arms race. For the monopolies, it has become a reliable source of income not subject to the fluctuations of crises. "The purpose of 'star wars,'" THE WASHINGTON POST admitted, "lies in the prospect of fabulous new riches for the military-industrial complex." It is well-known that without nuclear tests you cannot create "star wars" weapons...

That is obviously what lies behind Washington's position. Hence another dangerous phenomenon -- the progressive militarization, among right-wing circles, of political thought, which works primarily in terms of military strength. This is leading the administration away from the path that could lead from a peace based on weapons to a peace without weapons.

Perhaps Senator G. Hart was not far from the truth when he suggested that under the present administration it will not be possible to reach any accord in the arms control sphere. Of course, it is a pity if he, like the "circles in London" cited by THE TIMES on Friday who assert the same thing, is proved correct in this prophesy. It will be a pity if now, this year, yet another historic chance is missed along the path to ending the arms race. The negative consequences of this turn of events for world peace are easy to predict.

However, we would like to believe in the Americans' intelligence and virtue. Surely the people now responsible for their destiny are capable of rising above prejudices and dispassionately assessing the situation in the world and the good will of our country. The future can only be secured by taking into account the new realities of the modern world and turning to a new way of political thinking, intelligence, and common sense.

#### 'International Observers Round Table'

LD241823 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 24 Aug 86

["International Observers Round Table" program with Vadim Borisovich Kassis, editor in chief of the newspaper GOLOS RODINY and the journal OTCHIZNA; and Viktor Aleksandrovich Tsoppi, member of the editorial collegium of the weekly NOVOYE VREMYA; presented by Igor Pavlovich Charikov, foreign policy commentator of All-Union Radio]

[Text] [Charikov] Hello, esteemed comrades! Just under a week has passed since the day, or rather the evening, on which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev made his statement on Soviet television; and in the meantime this statement and the new Soviet foreign policy initiative contained in it -- the decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests until 1 January of next year -- continues to occupy the front pages of the world's major newspapers and main spots in television and radio newscasts. It gave rise to a broad response among political and public circles, too. Every day when we open our newspapers we see reports from different countries about reactions to the new foreign-policy actions of the Soviet Union. In their overwhelming majority these reactions are positive. They express support for this step and contain calls for the U.S. side to follow the Soviet example. However, there are also reactions that are negative, of course. First of all there was a negative reaction from the other side of the ocean, the very place toward which the appeal of the Soviet leadership was directed. In the course of our discussion we will talk about these things in greater detail.

Right now I would like to draw our listeners' attention to the following aspects of the issue. Few people living on our planet remained indifferent to the statement made by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on 18 August, and not just because the Soviet Union had made a difficult decision to refrain from carrying out nuclear explosions for test purposes. It's not just a question of the moratorium, although in and of itself the extension of the moratorium is viewed as a major foreign-policy action. The extension of the moratorium was received as yet further evidence of the political will of the Soviet Union, of its willingness to take part in dialogue with the U.S. side. It was regarded as a new manifestation of the peace-loving character of our foreign policy and as yet

another example of the Soviet Union's adherence to socialism as a social system and to the cause of the peace and security of the peoples, and of its responsibility for the fate of civilization. During just the first 8 months of this year our country, together with the fraternal socialist states, has put forward a whole series of large-scale initiatives covering different directions in foreign policy, but primarily in the field of disarmament. There is the program announced on 15 January, which deals with the stage-by-stage reduction of nuclear weapons throughout the whole world and their further elimination by the year 2,000; there is the package of constructive proposals which the Soviet Union has placed on the table of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space armaments. The set of measures dealing with the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals are also part of our foreign policy actions. And in his recent speech in Vladivostok, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev put forward a broad platform for ensuring security and cooperation in the Asian-Pacific region. All the actions I have mentioned -- including, of course, the extension of the moratorium of nuclear explosions -- are an integral part of our foreign policy and the system of international security, the fundamentals of which were formulated at the 27th CPSU Congress.

[Tsopp1] I think that one can state without any exaggeration, Igor Pavlovich, that new hope was born in the world last Monday -- the hope of deliverance. It is precisely the deliverance of mankind that our country was thinking about and concerning itself with when it made the decision to go ahead with continuing the moratorium on nuclear explosions. Silence will reign at our nuclear-testing sites for 5 more months -- a good silence, a peaceful silence, a silence which is to the liking of all normal people. The main thing is that having made up our minds to opt for this silence, having weighed carefully all the pro's and cons, the main thing is that we have acted in a very concrete and specific way, very constructively and very courageously, in order to prevent our planet from being plunged into the silence of the graveyard.

Bernard Lown, the world-famous U.S. scientist and humanist who is cochairman of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, had this to say when he heard about the decision announced by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee: A ban on nuclear explosions is a substantial, simple, and honest step which it is possible to verify. Nuclear weapons are a tool of world destruction. Life on earth is at the brink, and banning nuclear tests is the first step in the opposite direction. Yes, it is absolutely essential that we take a step back from the brink, beyond which lies the nuclear abyss. Only that kind of step is a step forward. Quite simply, there is no other solution; we simply do not have one.

But in order for this solution to become a practical reality, we cannot go on endlessly taking steps on our own. It is essential for the United States also to march in step, so to speak, with us in the same direction, at least just once; but it seems to be rooted to the spot on that fatal brink. As we know, the first official reaction from the White House was not simply defiant and negative, for it had quite obviously been prepared in advance; it was based neither upon an analysis of our position nor on anything else of a serious nature. And it amounted to this: No, we are not going to end our nuclear tests, because that would be damaging to our security or to the security of our allies. Furthermore, this was said so quickly, so hastily, one might even say, that the allies -- with the exception, say, of Britain -- were unable even to open their mouths in order to say what they found good or bad in the decision. This is hopefully not the last word from the United States.



Well, let's hope that the intellectual paralysis that has affected the opposition partners with whom we have been linked by history will not continue forever, that they will mature to the new thinking that is equal to the nuclear age, and that they will finally begin to realize that their vital interests, too, are not to be found in nuclear death, that we live in an integral world where everything is interlinked. Today it is impossible to raise the question: Who's doing what to whom? Today it has to be understood that, being mindful of the need to end the nuclear arms race, one has to adhere to the formula that no one must do anything to anyone.

The Soviet Union, having cast aside the system of prenuclear thinking, which, as is perfectly obvious, has become prehistoric and hence unacceptable as a way of thinking, is doing everything possible in its new approach to international problems, including things that even yesterday appeared impossible. Of course, we are taking a certain risk. But we are sure that in this situation, risk is a noble thing, and that it would be very beneficial from the standpoint of the Soviet Union and the United States, and it would be beneficial for all peoples, if we were able to sign a joint agreement ending nuclear tests at a Soviet-U.S. summit meeting before the end of the current year, which has been declared Peace Year by the United Nations.

Such an event, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed, would without a doubt be the main result in real terms of a meeting and would be a considerable step toward ending the arms race. It would be a kind of prologue to further progress at talks on nuclear armaments and their elimination, to a radical improvement in the whole world situation. I think that these months which lie ahead between now and 1 January, when our moratorium will end, are going to be very difficult. The desired prologue might not take place, if one bears in mind all the elements in the present U.S. position, dictated -- let's be quite blunt -- by imperial illusions. By all accounts there's not going to be any silence to wait for on the Nevada proving ground. The United States is going to test the nuclear devices that it needs for star wars, despite the fact that, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said, we will quickly find an answer that will nullify the value of the star wars program. In short, the struggle goes on. The Soviet Union is not alone on the battlefield. On our side are ever wider circles of the international public, the whole of mankind's intellectual potential, I would say; and intellect must triumph over madness. Our new bold movement forward along this path is in and of itself a victory, and not just for ourselves: it is a political victory for the whole of the world movement against nuclear war and is a new stimulus for it.

[Charikov] Continuing our discussion of the reaction brought about in the world by the Soviet Union's decision to extend the moratorium, I think that we should nevertheless return, if only briefly, to the roots of this issue. I know, Vadim Borisovich, you have said that you were in Canada on the day and at the time that our decision on the introduction of the moratorium was announced on the first occasion, and that there you were able to sense more specifically the way in which this decision by the Soviet Government was received.

[Kassis] Yes, that is quite right, Igor Pavlovich. I was in Canada, taking part in an international conference on the struggle for peace and progress, and I had the task of presenting a report and of listening to the reports of other participants in that conference. I have to say that virtually all of them stressed that it is now up to the United States and also the other states which possess nuclear weapons to put an end to their nuclear explosions. That would be not just a tribute to the memory of the victims of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Geoffrey Pearson, the former Canadian ambassador in Moscow, told me. Today he holds the important post of director of the Canadian Institute for Peace and Security. He stressed that goodwill on the part of the United States must also

be a real contribution to the strengthening of stability and peace on earth. In recalling that conversation today, one unfortunately has to state that -- as was noted in the statement by Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee -- the United States, which for 40 years has been the champion as far as the number of explosions is concerned, has exploded 18 more nuclear devices during the year of the Soviet Moratorium -- I repeat, 18 -- of which 3 were unannounced.

[Tsoppi] The fact that we know about those three explosions shows that today it is quite possible to monitor these explosions, no matter where they take place, using national resources.

[Charikov] That is one of those arguments that are disproved by life itself, one of those arguments that have been put forward by the U.S. side against halting nuclear tests. Incidentally, after the text of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement had been received in the United States, THE WASHINGTON POST published a fairly lengthy article on this problem -- an article, I would say, that tried to justify this hasty decision by the White House to reject the Soviet initiative or in some sense even to provide it with a theoretical foundation. This is what the newspaper writes: Some people consider tests -- meaning nuclear weapons tests -- to be the ignition key of the whole arms race. Suffice it to turn this key and the engine will stop. It's a very vivid comparison isn't it? Don't you agree?

[Tsoppi] Yes, it's a vivid one.

[Charikov] The newspaper goes on to say that this smacks of pure fantasy.

[Tsoppi] Why?

[Charikov] Because, in the newspaper's opinion, in a world in which the United States has to rely on nuclear weapons for an indeterminate length of time as the means of preventing the threat of an offensive strike, it makes sense to carry out the necessary tests in order to have more reliable, compact, and stable weapons.

[Kassis] But now let's look at what was said by Senator Edward Kennedy. He said that General Secretary Gorbachev's declaration that the Soviet Union will extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests until 1 January 1987 is only to be welcomed. This decision gives both sides yet another opportunity to forestall the appearance of new nuclear weapons that are even more lethal and to embark upon the path of ending the arms race, he added.

[Tsoppi] It must be said that it is not just sensibly minded people and politicians in the United States, but also those allies whose security is of such concern to Washington that have also reacted in a way which is far from being in unison with Washington. For example, West Germany simply welcomed the Soviet decision. This is of no small importance: this is the primary ally of the United States in Western Europe.

[Charikov] Quite right.

[Tsoppi] West Germany also stated that our new initiative, our new approach, raises the chances for holding a successful summit meeting and ultimately for ending all nuclear explosions. In addition, the French paper L'HUMANITE writes that the Soviet Union's decision is in keeping with feelings that are widespread in the world: Without the carrying out of tests it is impossible to improve nuclear armaments further. Surely it's not propaganda to demand an end to progress in means of destruction -- and propaganda is what Washington declared our new proposal to be.



[Charikov] Well, to talk about the reactions in the camp of the allies, first of all I want to mention the statement by the Foreign Office, Great Britain's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, with which the British hastened to come out immediately, soon after the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. If you remember, they expressed regret over such a proposal from the Soviet Union and expressed the wish that it would probably be better for the Soviet Union to pay attention to Western initiatives which are on the negotiating tables in various places.

I think, you see, that when we put forward a package, as I've already said, of constructive and in many ways compromise initiatives at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, we were indeed taking into account the interests of the Western side; while I would certainly call the hasty reaction of the Foreign Office, the British Ministry of Foreign Affairs, worthy of regret, the more so since in the British press, which reflects a considerable share of public opinion, there is no full unanimity of views regarding the extension of the Soviet moratorium. For example, THE GUARDIAN newspaper believes it to be a completely realistic and sensible step. It doesn't agree with official London's view.

[Kassis] Well, let's finally have a look at what's going on within the walls of the UN Organization. The statement by the general secretary, who, as the statement stresses, attaches extremely important significance to curbing the arms race -- in particular, the nuclear arms race -- has been circulated there. It says further that the general secretary has always adhered to the view that the attainment in the final analysis of an agreement on halting nuclear tests would serve common interests.

[Charikov] I want to quote one passage from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement, which, in my view, is very important. He said the following: On behalf of the Soviet people, I appeal to the reason and dignity of the American people not to miss yet again a historic chance on the road to halting the arms race. You see: The appeal goes to the reason and dignity of the American people. What's the point here? The whole point is that for a long time now the Reagan administration hasn't been expressing the interests of the whole of the American people -- as, incidentally, was the case with previous administration and many before it.

If, for example, we take a look at, let's say, the reaction in our country to this decision, then it is unanimous and positive. Meetings in support of the statement are taking place throughout the entire country. Yesterday, many-thousand-strong mass demonstrations in support of this decision took place in Moscow. In all of the fraternal socialist countries, the new Soviet initiative has received full support, as has already been said. And in the United States itself, as you were just saying, sufficiently reasonable and sensible voices can be heard. But in that case, whose opinion is President Reagan expressing? Whose opinion is he expressing when he rejects a most important foreign policy initiative from a main partner? That's why I think that this appeal to the reason and dignity of the American people has a definite point. I think that we once talked at this very round table about the fact that American public opinion has become substantially more mature and more sober with the passing of the years because it is now becoming more and more difficult to convince it that nuclear war is inevitable -- that's one thing -- and that it can be limited.

[Tsoppi] That it can bring victory.

[Charikov] Yes, and that one can win in it, gain a victory. The American people believe in such a demagogical formula less and less -- that war is inevitable and that it means that you can prepare for it and must prepare for it; and it is utterly unsurprising that

both the Senate and the House of Representatives -- that's the whole of the U.S. Congress -- have sent a signal in various forms to the President to the effect that it's time to come to a halt on this adventuristic path. In particular, the Senate has called on the President to resume talks on halting all nuclear tests, while the House of Representatives has decided not to allocate means for all nuclear tests for a year, with the exception of very small ones.

[Tsoppi] You're perfectly right, Igor Pavlovich. Only I wouldn't start generalizing about such a decisive opposition on the part of U.S. legislators to the U.S. President. I think that the point is that U.S. politicians today feel that both for the United States and for the whole of the rest of the world the policy of the White House is counterproductive, harmful, and dangerous. Today the American people feel how everywhere, literally on all continents, a movement is growing, in unison with which our foreign policy, too, is working.

[Kassis] Yes, I would also like to turn attention to the following aspect of the statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

He said: If there are no nuclear tests, then there will not be further improvement of nuclear weapons, either. Appeals addressed to the United States and the Soviet Union from a significant and authoritative section of the world community, among them the Delhi Six -- testify to this. Let us recall that the Delhi Six is a constantly functioning forum of the heads of countries of four continents: Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden. Literally a couple of days ago, in the Mexican city of Ixtapa, the representatives of the Six adopted the Mexican Declaration. This important document again contains an appeal for a halt to all nuclear explosions. The publication of it by the mass news media has caused wide response in the press, in whose comments high appraisal is given to the new and important step by the six states on the path of struggle with the peril of nuclear war. The fact that the six put forward new and important peace proposals addressed to the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union is unanimously evaluated by, for example, the Indian newspaper as evidence of serious concern on the part of the participants in the Mexico meeting over the absence -- through the fault of the United States... of proper progress in the Soviet-U.S. dialogue, aimed at achieving a treaty on banning all nuclear tests.

[Tsoppi] Notice that the United States hasn't responded to this appeal.

[Kassis] Not at all.

[Tsoppi] But we have responded, in that very important statement which we are talking about now. Mikhail Sergeyevich directly connected our position with the position of these six states which today are so courageously and consistently coming out for peace, and against the nuclear danger.

[Charikov] In his reply to the message of the leaders of the countries of the Delhi Six, which was broadcast yesterday on radio and television and which is published in the newspapers today, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed that the Soviet Union has gone for a unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions, guided by a feeling of responsibility for the fate of mankind. If the United States were also to join the Soviet moratorium -- and our extension of the moratorium gives it an additional chance for this -- then a serious and responsible step would be made toward halting the improvement of the most destructive weapons and the accumulation of its stocks. Such a bilateral moratorium, noted Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, would undoubtedly help to ban the testing of nuclear weapons in treaty form as well. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev highly evaluated the

efforts of the Delhi Six and their active work aimed at shifting from a standstill the resolving of a key question in the cause of lessening the risk of nuclear war. What's actually happening is that the members of the Delhi Six are addressing two nuclear powers, but are getting replies from only one -- replies, moreover, in deeds as well as words.

[Tsoppi] The whole world is getting replies from only one power, from us.

[Kassis] All our actions are precisely supported by specific steps.

[Tsoppi] When I say the whole world, this is no exaggeration, since, in a few days' time, in Harare, the capital of Zimbabwe -- a young African state, one of the youngest -- the eighth conference of the heads of states and governments of the nonaligned countries is to take place. This, if we talk on a world scale, is a very serious movement in our present-day world.

At the outset, in 1961, when the first conference was held, it had a membership of only 25 countries, while today it comprises 102 countries with the most varied political systems and the most varied policies, because, at the very moment when that truly worldwide movement arose, its essence came to be the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, apartheid, and racism, all forms of oppression, and -- what is particularly important in today's world situation -- against the danger of war, any acts of aggression, armed intervention, military pressure on young states, and bloc politics. One of the most important objectives of the movement came to be the struggle for the democratization of international life. And the current problems in the world can be resolved only through democratic discussion -- frank and serious political discussion.

[Kassis] Now let's take another area about which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke in his statement. Two tragedies, linked with the technology of the nuclear and space age, have occurred recently: the deaths of the Challenger crew and the accident at the Chernobyl AES. They have intensified anxiety and have reminded us that people are still only getting the feel of the fantastically powerful forces that they themselves have brought into being. They are still only learning how to apply them in the service of progress. These events provided an object lesson about what would happen if nuclear weapons are brought into play. Everyone, especially statesmen and politicians, ought to derive concrete lessons from it. How, then, did people in the United States react to the destruction of Challenger? President Reagan has officially announced his decision to start building a new reusable spaceship which is to replace Challenger. Its cost is unbelievable: about \$2.8 billion. At the same time, the President announced that henceforth the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will not deal with commercial satellite launches through contracts with private companies. It follows from the President's declaration that U.S. vehicles of the shuttle type will be used primarily for launches that serve national-security interests.

[Tsoppi] In other words, goodbye to the peaceful exploration of space!

[Kassis] Exactly. Thus, the arms race is not slowing down. An intensified militarization of the United States and the whole NATO bloc is underway. A real threat that highly dangerous nuclear payloads will be put into space has at last appeared.

[Charikov] But then, to take those two examples -- Challenger and Chernobyl -- the only thing they have in common is what you said, Vadim Borisovich: that is, they are two tragedies which have shown mankind how powerless we still are in the event that technology gets out of control. But Challenger was aimed at quite specific militarist objectives, whereas, after all, the Chernobyl AES was a peaceful establishment.

Nevertheless, even in this sphere -- in the sphere of the peaceful use of atomic energy -- our country is striving to undertake any measures in order, firstly, to rule out various accidents and, secondly, in the event of really unforeseen accidents, in the event of extreme situations, to arrange international cooperation that could eliminate these consequences with all possible speed.

The other day, in Vienna, two conventions, or draft conventions, were drawn up at the initiative of the Soviet Union. These conventions may come to be the inaugural documents of a system for the safe development of nuclear-power engineering.

Like the vast majority of those attending the recent conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Soviet Union supports the idea that urgent notification should be carried out in the event of any nuclear accidents, both at peaceful establishments and at establishments of military significance, including accidents with nuclear weapons and with the testing of them. This proposal turned out to be unacceptable to the United States.

[Tsoppi] Our time is probably almost up. I should like to quote from my favorite writer, I must admit, who as responded to the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. I mean Viktor Astafyev. He said these penetrating, in my view, humane words, quote: If it is necessary to destroy the world and mankind for the sake of proving the superiority of one's own system, to die when proving the purity and loftiness of ideas, then what is the purpose of these ideas, systems, and philosophies, which have brought the world to the brink of destruction? Who will need them? There is enough space on earth for all people, and there is no need to reach for a weapon whenever there arises between us some misunderstanding or disagreement. Unquote.

[Charikov] It would, I think, be very wise if these words, which really are -- I agree with you, Viktor Aleksandrovich -- simply penetrating, were to be imprinted in the memories...

[Tsoppi interrupting] ...Of those politicians who are trying to control world destiny.

[Charikov] I quite agree with you. Well now, esteemed comrades, our broadcast is at an end. On behalf of those taking part, I thank you for your attention and take my leave of you. Goodbye! All the best!

White House 'Incompatible Statements'

JPRS-TAC-86-075  
18 September 1986

LD260410 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 25 Aug 86

[Valentin Zorin commentary]

[Excerpts] Radio Moscow observer Valentin Zorin comments on statements by American officials made in connection with the Soviet Union's decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing to the end of this year: Judging from the reports, Mikhail Gorbachev's statement on the extension of the moratorium has caused differences and, I would even say, confusion among high-ranking members of the Republican administration. At first the White House spokesman, Larry Speakes, who did not even bother to familiarize himself with the text of the Soviet leader's statement, hurried to announce the White House's negative attitude toward the Soviet initiative. He said the United States had no intention to join it and planned to continue nuclear tests. The man in charge of the White House's staff, Donald Regan, came up with assurances that the administration was not in principle against the treaty that ban nuclear weapons tests universally and completely but was for proper verification of the treaty of this kind. He added that as soon as the United States became certain of the effectiveness of that control the advance might be made towards the signing of such a treaty.

In short, in the course of 1 week the White House press secretary and the chief of the White House's staff made two absolutely incompatible statements. One official claimed that the United States would never agree to the halting of tests and the other said that Washington was not, allegedly, against it provided there is the proper verification system. So what is actually the matter? I personally think that Larry Speakes, who had no time for contemplation, actually gave away what the White House really thought on the matter. As for Donald Regan, he tried to resort to propaganda tricks in order to mislead public opinion. It is hard to imagine that the head of the White House's staff does not know what the whole world knows today: The Soviet Union is ready to accept all forms of control over a nuclear test ban. Mikhail Gorbachev underlined on many occasions that the Soviet Union is prepared to agree to any broad forms of control, ranging from national to international, including on-site inspections. The American Administration knows without a doubt about the information registered by the American experts who installed their instruments close to the Soviet nuclear testing ground situated in the vicinity of the city of Semipalatinsk in Central Asia. The American seismologists registered on this equipment nuclear explosions and not the Soviet ones -- there was none of them -- but the ones that were carried out in Nevada. Donald Regan knows this all too well, of course. Why then does he try to create the impression that the already resolved verification problem is allegedly the stumbling block in the way of halting nuclear tests? There can be only one answer to this question: Washington lacks arguments for justifying its refusal to follow the Soviet Union's example. [passage omitted]

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 25 Aug 86 pp 1-4

[Article by Enver Mamedov, APN political analyst, under the rubric "News and Views": "World Demanding an End to Nuclear Tests. Washington Resorting to Unworthy Tricks."]

[Text] Moscow's extension of its moratorium on nuclear explosions is being keenly discussed in the world. Having hoped that the Soviet Union would show reason and good will, world public opinion was not disappointed. Most socio-political forces of the planet have positively received the courageous and well-thought-out decision of the Soviet leadership. Many governments, including some U.S. NATO allies, the New Delhi Six, the majority of the Non-Aligned Movement countries and, of course, the peoples of the USSR and socialist states, greeting the action of the Soviet Union, insist that Washington should follow its example.

All responsible figures, public organizations and groups anxious to move the key issue of ending the danger of nuclear war from a standstill regard the termination of all nuclear tests as the most urgent and important task of our time. They realize how difficult it was for the Soviet Union to decide on moratorium extension amidst nuclear blasts on the proving ground in Nevada. Nevertheless, as Mikhail Gorbachev stresses in his reply to the leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania, we believe that our unilateral action is justified because it must ease the solution of the problem of nuclear tests and the deliverance of mankind from nuclear threat. In taking this step, continues the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, we trust that people in all countries will correctly assess the long silence on Soviet testing grounds.

Yes, the majority of people in all countries and on all continents are highly appreciative of this silence. At the same time they demand with redoubled energy that the United States should join the Soviet moratorium, having received a historic chance for this. A bilateral moratorium would open the door to a world without nuclear weapons.

In his reply to the message of the leaders of the Six, Mikhail Gorbachev notes that the United Nations has not yet exhausted its potential in resolving the test-end issue and that it should be more actively used. A disarmament conference can be an important forum for multilateral negotiations on the same issue, along with the Soviet-American talks which started in Geneva at the end of July.

Mikhail Gorbachev accepts the proposal of the Six for a meeting of its experts with Soviet and American experts. Such a meeting could make a valuable contribution to achieving a comprehensive ban on tests and to commencing an active, businesslike multilateral dialogue on these questions.

The Soviet Union, he reaffirmed, will readily use the offer of the Six to render help in monitoring the cessation of tests, including on-site inspections, provided, of course, that the United States too agrees to this.

Touching on a second Soviet-American summit, Mikhail Gorbachev declares that the Soviet Union is for the holding of such a meeting, but that it should promote better relations between the USSR and the USA, a healthier international climate and speedier arms control negotiations. "For example, we would be ready there to sign an agreement on terminating nuclear tests." To put it briefly, the Soviet and U.S. leaders' meeting should be filled with practical content. Herein lies the substance of their Geneva understanding.

So it is up to Washington. We in the Soviet Union are well aware of how large are the forces in the United States which resist the cessation of the arms race and fear like fire a stop to nuclear tests. The influence of these forces has determined the hasty negative reaction of a White House spokesman and the U.S. propaganda machinery to the Soviet initiative. Supporters of the nuclear arms race, opposing any Soviet proposal aimed at the termination of this race, have no scruples and embark on the outright deception of world and U.S. opinion.

Though the Soviet Union's stand on control over the implementation of agreements reducing nuclear and conventional arms and banning nuclear tests is well known, the Washington propaganda outfit keeps on falsely alleging that "the Russians are against verification and control." The Soviet Union has on many occasions declared its adherence to strict control, including international, and agrees to on-site inspections. But that deliberate lie still lingers on in the U.S. press and the speeches of administration members, let alone the representatives of various reactionary "foundations" and "associations."

Give thought to the basic distinction in approaches of our two states to the question of nuclear tests. For twelve months the Soviet Union carried out not a single nuclear explosion and on August 18 declared that it would continue its moratorium until the beginning of next year. This is not a mere proposal, or a declaration, or rhetoric. It is a concrete action, a concrete deed. The American side, ignoring world public opinion, has been carrying on tests and at the same time endlessly adding conditions on which it may some day agree to test termination. In fact, it doesn't mean even that, but just possible restrictions of tests, yet again on the condition of fulfilment of a countless number of baseless and at times senseless demands.

Washington declares that it cannot give up tests so long as nuclear weapons exist. According to it, they have to be checked ("what if they have grown damp?") and improved. And what if the available stockpiles aren't enough to incinerate mankind? When the authors of these flimsy "arguments" get rebuff even from influential American figures and experts, they quickly change the theme and begin to say that without balanced conventional arms progress is impossible. But when proposals for such balanced conventional arms are put on the negotiating table, they vaguely expatiate that this also is not enough.

The question of human rights then pops up. But if matters are conducted in such a way, then the solution of the problem of nuclear tests, of reducing and destroying nuclear arsenals will drag on for decades. It may so happen that there will be simply no one to sign an appropriate agreement. We favour



acting rather than talking. Nuclear threat is increasing. Washington, despite its first negative comments, has not yet given a definitive official reply to the Soviet proposals. But whatever manoeuvres and tricks it may make, the U.S. administration will not escape the fact that its attitude to the Soviet moratorium is in the eyes of the public the touchstone by which it will judge the responsibility of its choice: to use or refuse to use one more historic chance on the path to ending the arms race.

(APN, August 24. In full.)

#### SDI Connection Noted

LD261905 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 26 Aug 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] What is Washington's reaction to the new peace initiative from Moscow? Initially, in the U.S. capital an attempt was made to call the Soviet Union's action "propaganda." But this argument, if it can be called such a thing, immediately showed itself to be untenable.

If the Soviet Union is engaged in such propaganda, why should the United States not follow its example and reply in kind, also halting nuclear tests?

It was sufficient to pose such a rhetorical question -- and many Western publicists and politicians were posing it last week -- and the answer would come of its own accord, and not in favor of the United States.

At last, in the past few days, fresh voices have been heard from Washington. As is claimed by a State Department representative, the point at issue has nothing to do with halting nuclear explosions, but reducing nuclear weapons.

But surely everyone realizes that in order to reverse the flywheel of the arms race, it first has to be halted. In this respect, I think THE WASHINGTON POST was right to call tests the ignition key to the whole arms race and to state: Once you turn off the key, the engine will die. But our country surely is not proposing to stop at that? Nothing of the sort.

The Soviet program for the stage-by-stage complete liquidation of nuclear arms by the year 2000 was presented in the January statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Our specific proposals on this subject have long lain on the table of the Soviet-U.S. talks. But the fact is, some people in Washington are obviously trying to use the Geneva talks and the current meetings of the Soviet experts on disarmament problems only as a blind, to coin a phrase, to pacify the public.

True, it seems that more and more people in the West are becoming aware of these truly propagandistic maneuvers by Washington. In this connection, I think two readers' letters published the other day by London's THE GUARDIAN are noteworthy. They are written in the traditional English manner:

Sir, your letter contains some annoying mistakes.



And it goes on to cite such facts and arguments as: It was not the Soviet Union but the United States that carried out more nuclear tests. Their complete halting would be the most logical first step to stopping and then reversing the nuclear arms race. In this major question, the moral high ground the United States so often lays claim to, belongs to the USSR, the authors of the letters write. And they sign: sincerely, Dr Jeremy Legget, Verification Technology Information Center, and Lee Chadwick, Defense Information Group, Manchester.

Incidentally, the letters quite frankly point to the real reason for the U.S. refusal to halt nuclear tests. As THE GUARDIAN itself admits, they are being carried out in the United States during the development of third generation nuclear devices for star wars.

Indeed, the Pentagon has recently held routine tests of the ASAT antisatellite system. Incidentally, these tests were carried out in the face of a decision by the U.S. Congress, which refused to approve allocation to this version of star wars. The Pentagon is obviously much more inclined to listen to the wishes of the U.S. military-industrial complex rather than the voices of congressmen.

### U.S. 'Nuclear Fanaticism'

LD262103 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 26 Aug 86

[Gennadiy Gerasimov commentary; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Hello, comrades! The United States had a number of objections to the Soviet moratorium: that the Soviet Union is not agreeable to monitoring and verification; that monitoring and verification are technically impossible; and that America would somehow find itself in a worse situation; and several other arguments that on the surface seem difficult but in essence have one common feature -- they are all far-fetched.

These arguments are stagnant, almost lifeless. From time to time they mutter about monitoring, then straightaway they shut up because Soviet readiness and the technical feasibility of it have removed the issue. Washington has been deprived of propaganda ammunition; they have nothing to object to. This is borne out by the notable fact that Larry Speakes, the White House spokesman, at his latest briefing refused to comment on journalists' questions on yesterday's news conference in Moscow.

Washington is now looking for fresh arguments and has thought up two. Speakes and others are talking about a long list of subjects for discussion and testing is just one of them. Speakes' method of solving one of the issues, among a number of others, is taken from Anderson's fairy-tale ("Steel"). In this tale, in order to find out where the princess disappears to at nights he chalked a cross on the gates of the house, but a magic dog noticed this and placed a cross on the gates of all the houses in the town. Anderson writes that this was a clever trick. But in our case, one cannot say that this is a particularly smart thing in the argument as to whether testing is just one small point on the agenda. It's a weak argument because the Soviet Union is not saying that a moratorium is an end in itself. And, as stated in the Mexican Declaration, this is a first step on the road to concluding a treaty on a complete test ban and an end to the production and deployment of all types of nuclear weapons, and space weapons as well.

They have also thought up some kind of philosophical argument, to the effect that armaments do not start wars, people do. This maxim is a dangerous simplification. Yes, people and politicians make the decisions, but they may find themselves under the influence, and even under the power, of technological fanaticism. And the signs of this in Washington are clear. All they can see there is testing and nothing else. The world may be left to perish, but long live testing! And "star wars" for the future!

Of course, the banal greediness of today's merchants of death plays a large part here. But together with this greediness, in tandem with it in the arms race, is technological fanaticism, too, if one defines fanaticism as being so carried away by the means that the objective is lost sight of. The arms race in itself whips up, stimulates and inspires. And so it turns out that although armaments do not start wars, the arms fanatics can have a fateful influence on the politician who makes the decisions.

At the meeting in Mexico Argentine President Raul Alfonsin said that the arms race has ceased to be a mere consequence of political tension between the two powers and has turned into being one of the main reasons for this tension. And an end to testing could be just the thing to break this wanton mutual-dependence. And another thing: A rejection of testing would not only place an obstacle in the way of the emergence of new and more refined types of nuclear weapons. Such a rejection would help shoots of trust to sprout forth.

Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou said -- also in Mexico --- that from the psychological point of view an end to testing would help to create the right atmosphere for overcoming the deadlock in the disarmament talks. The bold Soviet step reflects political realism, whereas the obstinate American "no" is nuclear fanaticism.

#### British Attitude Hit

LD252227 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 25 Aug 86

[Nikolay Borin commentary]

[Text] When London expressed its regret over the Soviet commitment to the moratorium it became clear why Mikhail Gorbachev had said it had not been easy to take the decision on extending it once again. One can easily understand these words from the military point of view, but the reaction of Washington and London shows that Moscow's self-imposed ban had also clashed with the fundamental political thinking of those who rule America and Britain today. To them, the long silence at Soviet nuclear test sites is highly annoying for it leaves them with no argument but to claim that the world is again faced with a Soviet propaganda ploy. However, the truth is that banning nuclear tests is the simplest and most effective first step towards curbing the nuclear arms race.

Indeed, significantly, nobody in the Reagan administration or in Whitehall ventures to argue with that and the more the Soviet measure gathers worldwide support, the more political leaders in Washington and London express their regret about it. Actually, this is regret that there is another approach, another way of thinking which refuses to accept force as the main guarantee of security today. The character of modern

weapons, primarily nuclear weapons, demands a new political philosophy and new principles of ensuring peace. For Washington, the prime consideration appears to be that nuclear tests are essential in developing practically any new nuclear weapons systems, whether these be programs for modernizing warheads for intercontinental missiles or developing vital components of cruise missiles or air bombs.

Since the Soviet moratorium came into effect over a year ago, various types of tests have been carried out in Nevada. They include the MX, Trident, Midgetman, and star wars programs. Now companies in the American war industry are speaking of nuclear weapons of the third generation, which are much more destructive but are euphemistically termed peacekeepers. Such deception is practiced by high-ranking American politicians, military-industrial tycoons, and generals. The Soviet side, however has far-reaching reasons to regard these declarations by champions of the peace through strength idea as mere propaganda. Under this cover one can easily discern a bid to secure a decisive military edge over the Soviet Union and its allies. If the Governments of the United States and Britain really want effective arms control, they should be quick to appreciate the importance of the Soviet initiative. And if President Reagan really does adhere to his widely proclaimed goal of making nuclear weapons both impotent and obsolete, he now has a wonderful chance to show it. All he needs is to sign an agreement banning nuclear tests which could be done this year at a Soviet-American summit. Britain in particular, as an active contributor to earlier progress in nuclear test limitation today, has an excellent opportunity to reassert its role in world affairs and to win international acclaim by joining in the efforts to achieve a comprehensive nuclear test ban and thereby help reduce the threat of nuclear war.

#### Message From Thatcher

LD261754 Moscow TASS in English 1614 GMT 26 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 26 TASS -- Anatoliy Kovalev, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, received today N. Marshall, charge d'affaires ad interim of Britain in the Soviet Union, who handed over a personnel message of Margaret Thatcher, prime minister of Britain, to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

During a conversation they discussed some topical problems, specifically those connected with the Soviet unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions.

London TIMES Cited

PM261322 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Aug 86 First Edition p 4

[A. Maslennikov "Rejoinder": "When There Is No Argument"]

[Text] Western propagandists are clearly at a loss when it comes to the USSR's decision to extend its moratorium on nuclear explosions to the beginning of next year. London's THE TIMES, failing to find any reasonable argument to justify the West's refusal to endorse the moratorium, called the decision "propaganda subterfuge."

According to the paper's upside-down "logic," the criterion of the seriousness of the Soviet approach to the arms control problem would be nothing other than... the "abandonment of this subterfuge," in other words, the resumption of nuclear explosions. Now there is "back-to-front logic" for you.

In fairness it should be said, however, that THE TIMES does offer an entirely plausible argument in an effort to explain why the idea of a nuclear moratorium is so obstinately rejected by the West. "The Russians must realize," it writes, "that there will be no possibility of an accord on a general nuclear test ban treaty as long as President Reagan is in power since, in his view, it is important for the United States to have a program for testing its weapon systems."

Well, it is possible that London has an even clearer picture of what is going on in the Washington political kitchen. This, however, cannot be grounds for rejecting a nuclear moratorium, the idea of which is winning wider and wider support not only among the people's masses, but also among wider and wider government circles in various countries of the world.

UN Circulates Gorbachev Speech

LD261505 Moscow TASS in English 1419 GMT 26 Aug 86

[Text] New York August 26 TASS -- The text of the statement made by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, over the Soviet television on August 18 has been circulated at the United Nations Organization as an official document of the U.N. General Assembly.

LD271634 Moscow TASS in English 1610 GMT 27 Aug 86

By refusing to join the Soviet Union's extended moratorium on nuclear explosions, official Washington has found itself in growing isolation as it demonstratively ignores world public concern and even the opinion of its own allies. Of course, the American Administration is using all levers at its disposal to compel the allies to follow in the wake of its short-sighted and extremely dangerous course towards instigating the nuclear arms race and continuing nuclear tests. The more indicative in this respect, is that despite Washington's arm-twisting tactics, a murmur is rising in Western countries, turning ever more often into criticism of the U.S. negative stand. Undoubtedly, noted the British journal, NEW STATESMAN, the present-day position of the United States and Great Britain on this major problem put them in actual isolation in the world arena.

Many other Western European mass media bodies also draw attention to the process of growing concern. A number of Western European countries, according to the French newspaper, LIBERATION, intend to persuade Washington to adopt a more realistic attitude since, at the moment, the Soviet side alone is offering a goodwill gesture. Elaborating this idea, REUTERS reported that several NATO member countries stuck to a view on nuclear tests which was different from that of Washington following Moscow's decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear blasts. The news agencies named among those who disagreed with Washington on this issue Norway, Denmark, and Greece. The list could be extended. The latest example is the statement by the Netherlands' Defence Minister Van Eekelen about his government's intention to urge President Reagan to join the Soviet nuclear test moratorium.

Willy Brandt, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, pointed out the other day that Washington should take into account the interests of the Federal Republic of Germany and Western Europe. How far from reality are Washington's allegations that test moratorium does not meet security interests of the U.S., its friends or allies.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1539

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### MOSCOW PRESS CONFERENCE ON MORATORIUM EXTENSION

#### TV Broadcast

LD260230 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1850 GMT 25 Aug 86

[USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs press conference on 18 August Gorbachev statement conducted by Yuliy Vorontsov, USSR first deputy minister of foreign affairs; Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, USSR first deputy defense minister and chief of the Armed Forces General Staff; and Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs; in the Press Center of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 25 August -- recorded]

[Text] [Vorontsov] The statement by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on 18 August on one of the key problems in international politics -- the ending of nuclear tests and the decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions to 1 January 1987, stands, it can be said without exaggeration, at the center of the world's attention. A noticeable nervousness prevails now in Washington; contradictory arguments are made in favor of the United States continuing nuclear explosions. Here are a few examples: White House Chief of State Donald Regan speaks about the United States supposedly not being against a treaty on a comprehensive and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests, but it cannot, so he says, go for it without an appropriate monitoring system. Other representatives of the U.S. President reject the monitoring thesis and bluntly say that the United States needs the tests to improve its nuclear weapons. Washington has also muddled its arguments as to who is catching up with whom in the nuclear arms. Essentially, the United States has no rational explanations as to why it does not want to join the Soviet moratorium, if of course, it will not be acknowledged that the nuclear explosions are needed by the United States exclusively for continuing the nuclear arms race in a vain attempt to achieve military superiority. And of course the matter does not lie in monitoring. The Soviet Union has, in essence, proposed all sorts of monitoring even, in our opinion, sometimes over and above requirements. The United States all the same will not take up halting nuclear tests. As is now clear to all, here Washington is hardly moved by concern over monitoring but an attempt to create a cover in order to continue to carry out work for creating new classes and types of nuclear weapons.

There is every basis now for ending the nuclear fever on earth once and for all by means of a Soviet-U.S. moratorium, and subsequently, a treaty. The question of a moratorium should not be examined in isolation, and not only as a measure toward ending nuclear explosions, but in the context of the overall problem, that of delivering mankind from nuclear weapons, as a kind of prologue to complete nuclear disarmament.

[Gerasimov] And now? Please let us have your questions.

[Reporter] I'm from Soviet TV's "Vremya" program. In connection with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement both official circles and the press in the United States are placing the main stress now on the correspondence between the two leaders. Various leaks are taking place. Encouraging hints are made. In particular they claim that, in his last message to Comrade Gorbachev, Reagan made constructive proposals in the sphere of disarmament. In particular this allegedly concerns the problem of halting nuclear tests too. What can you say about this?

[Vorontsov] The correspondence between the leaders of the two states is confidential, in accordance with existing agreement and the practice of many years. Therefore, it is not for me to reveal its contents here.

But I must say that since Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's 18 August statement, Washington has indeed been making use of deliberate leaks in an attempt to distract U.S. and world public attention from the points raised in the statement, the possibility of the United States joining the moratorium on all nuclear explosions and the early conclusions of an agreement on halting them. It is quite obvious that such leaks are clearly intended to delude people and to present a more favorable impression of Washington's position to the outside world, to make it look constructive when in fact it is not. Since the leaks emanate from U.S. officials, it really is difficult for people to work out what the correspondence between the two leaders was about. It is all the more difficult given the truly complex nature of the questions now worrying not just the U.S. public but also the public throughout the world.

If you would like to know my view, I can tell you that I personally think that in such a matter it is probably better not to play with leaks but to inform the world public of the true contents of the letters that were exchanged between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan, so that people throughout the world have an opportunity to judge for themselves the true nature of the correspondence and the proposals contained therein. But, naturally, it is not for you or me to resolve this question here. It is the responsibility of the leaders of the two countries to decide whether or not to reveal the contents of their correspondence.

[Gerasimov] Please go ahead, TASS.

[Reporter] I'm Vashedchenko from TASS. Can you tell us what Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev had in mind when he said that the Soviet Union would find a response that would render the SDI program for star wars worthless?

[Akhromeyev] When they speak about the U.S. preparations for star wars, what is meant is their preparation for the deployment of a multi-stage system of antimissile defense for the territory of the United States, and for the creation [sozdaniye] and deployment of space-strike weapons. The purpose of the U.S. preparation for star wars, that is the implementation of what I have said, is to devalue the strategic nuclear forces of the Soviet Union; that is, to disarm the USSR and thus provide the United States of America with the opportunity to permanently threaten the Soviet Union with a mass nuclear missile strike.

Two aspects are being pursued, and there are two aspects here: on the political level, the deployment of the antimissile defense system of the country and space-strike weapons undermines the existing balance and leads the talks between the Soviet Union and the United States on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms into a dead end. It undermines faith in realistic nature of these talks. It creates instead of stability strategic chaos and sharply increases the risk of nuclear war.

On a purely military level this program undermines the existing military balance. If the United States continues work to implement its star wars plans, the Soviet Union will have to take appropriate measures, and if necessary we will quickly find an answer; moreover, this will not be the one the United States expects it to be. It will be an answer that will invalidate the star wars program. This was clearly stated by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the party, in his statement. As a military man, I can say that the United States does not possess a monopoly of scientific-technical progress in military matters. The development of science and technology in the military-technology field has reached a level where the eternal struggle between the sword and the shield, between defensive and offensive weapons, is today being solved not in one, but in several directions. For every action, a reliable means of counteraction can be found.

In response to the action by the United States undermining the balance with the help of the creation of the country's antimissile defense and space-strike weapons, the Soviet Union could undertake an identical answer. It is in the position to do this. Strategic offensive weapons, too, can be perfected to such an extent as to make the program for the antimissile defense of U.S. territory a fabulously expensive and extremely difficult matter to accomplish.

Other answers that will invalidate the star wars program are also possible. In this situation the Soviet Union is forced to carry out fundamental research in many directions. Among them are those which envisage, with sufficient confidence, effective measures for counteracting the antimissile defense of the country's territory. Moreover, these measures can be promptly implemented. If the United States does indeed deploy its in-depth system of antimissile defense of the country and space-strike weapons, the Soviet Union will select those methods of action that, to the utmost extent, meet the interests of its defense capabilities and in its turn will confront the United States with the need to seek an answer to this. Our measures will not be those to which Washington would like to incline us.

[Gerasimov] Here is a question from Franz Koestler of Austrian TV: The West is putting forward the idea of an interim agreement, which would envisage a gradual reduction in the number of nuclear explosions at the same time as a reduction in nuclear arsenals. What is your view, Yuliy Mikhaylovich?

[Vorontsov] I think such proposals are dictated by a wish to retain a loophole for the continuation of the arms race, rather by a wish to put an end to the arms race, to halt it. Judge for yourselves. Why is it necessary to continue nuclear tests on some limited scale or reduced scale when they can all be stopped now. All the scientific-technical groundwork exists for this. One side, the Soviet Union, is already in favor of this. All other countries are calling for this. Look at the activities of the Delhi Six. All nuclear explosions can and must be halted. Therefore, I feel that one should not attach too much significance to proposals that still imply a continuation of the arms race.

[Gerasimov] The same correspondent, Franz Koestler of Austrian TV, continues: Is it possible to draw up the clause dealing with the banning of tests in such a way that it remains possible to work on the modernization of armaments, so that it leaves some room for research within the SDI framework?

[Vorontsov] In my opinion this is not a question from an Austrian journalist but rather from the people in command of SDI development. Of course they would like to have this possibility. But the world does not want to leave this possibility open.



There is clearly a dispute here. This must be decided by the world in opposition to the U.S. Administration.

[Gerasimov] Martti Hoeser from Finnish TV asks: In justifying the U.S. Administration's refusal to halt nuclear explosions, certain U.S. representatives claim that the Soviet Union is in a position to proclaim a moratorium because it is well ahead of the United States in tests. What do you have to say in response to this argument?

[Akhromeyev, laughing] Unfortunately, I have to state that the United States is not lagging behind the Soviet Union in nuclear tests. Such statements are not in accordance with reality. The facts say something else. The United States is currently the leader in nuclear tests.

If one takes all the nuclear tests by all countries carried out over all time, the United States has carried out over 50 percent of nuclear tests out of the overall number carried out by all countries. Furthermore, in each sphere taken separately, be it in the air, underground or under water, the United States has conducted more nuclear tests than the Soviet Union.

This year, as one knows, since 1 August 1985, that is for over a year, the Soviet Union has not been carrying out nuclear tests, while the United States has carried out 18 such tests.

Those are the facts. Where then can there be any question of lagging behind? The point has nothing to do with lagging behind, but the desire to modernize and completely renew strategic nuclear forces. For that, new warheads are needed. There is also the desire to develop the country's antimissile defense, and for that, nuclear power sources are needed. Therefore, the United States is opposed to banning nuclear tests.

[Gerasimov] Go ahead, please.

[Reporter] Here is a question from GDR TV. Would you tell us, please, whether or not you are afraid that your country's defense capability will be weakened as a result of a lengthy moratorium?

[Akhromeyev] The question of stopping nuclear tests has two sides. It has both the political and the military side. From the political viewpoint the question is for peace-loving states and the world public to achieve a ban on nuclear tests through their joint efforts. In answering an earlier question I have already commented on this case. In essence, there will be a prohibition on the further development of nuclear weapons -- that is, on the creation of new weapons systems -- in that case, it will be seriously impeded if not made impossible. [sentence as heard]

It is natural that the Soviet Union, as a peace-loving state, has an interest in this. In announcing the moratorium it calculates that peace-loving states and the world public will support it in this matter.

The military side, this is a serious matter: We know who we are dealing with and we have a lot of experience, but in the given instance we are all together in the Soviet Union, both the political leadership and the military leadership see this matter in a comprehensive way, and although it is not simple for us and we have to make a very careful assessment of the correlation of forces, and the correlation in the area of nuclear tests, we consider that as yet it is tolerable to accept a certain degree of detriment. [sentence as heard]

The country's defence capability is being maintained, both as far as our country and as far as our friends and allies are concerned. It is being maintained at an appropriate level.

[Studio announcer] A question from French TV: What initiatives can other nuclear powers -- France, for example take to alter the present situation?

[Vorontsov] As I have already said, many countries have made initiatives in this respect. I repeat once again that the example of the Delhi Six is an illustration of this. When the halting of nuclear tests is discussed at the forthcoming UN General Assembly session, various other states can, of course, contribute by submitting specific proposals on monitoring and other aspects of halting nuclear blasts.

As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has pointed out in his answer to the leaders of the six countries in the Delhi Six, we would not be opposed to the resumption of talks in which the participants include Britain. Such talks, between the USSR, the United States and Britain, have been held in the past but they were broken off and we were not to blame for this. As far as France is concerned, we would welcome any steps France could take in this sphere. But I repeat: At the moment we are saying that the questions involved in halting nuclear tests should be specifically dealt with by the two large countries, the USSR and United States, which in fact carry out most of these tests. They, of course, must start the process. But the subsequent adherence of other countries to both the moratorium and to a possible agreement on this would be welcomed in every possible way.

[Gerasimov] There is a question from the GDR news agency: There are people in the United States who feel that explosions are needed to test the reliability of stocks of nuclear weapons. What is your view on this?

[Akhromeyev] I must say that, on the whole and to some extent, this does correspond to reality: A proportion of nuclear tests being carried out by both sides is carried out by them for the purposes of verifying already existing nuclear devices and for the purpose of determining the extent to which they are reliable. This proportion however, is immeasurably small. Let us put it this way: Approximately 80 percent of nuclear tests and possibly more are carried out for the purpose of testing new nuclear devices destined for the new nuclear arms being manufactured or for energy sources for space in order to deploy offensive nuclear arms there. However, the USSR does, after all, propose to mutually halt nuclear tests. This means that the USSR halts them and the United States halts them. This means that neither our nuclear weapons, nor U.S. nuclear weapons will undergo reliability tests. After all, we thus place the sides in the same conditions. That is why it is not this -- and I repeat again -- it is not this that constitutes the main cause; the main cause is the desire to create more and more new nuclear arms systems.

[Reporter] Mikhnovich, APN The other day some Western newspapers reported that the Soviet Union is building two powerful radar stations in the western part of the Soviet Union that are intended to detect missiles. Is this in fact that case? If so, to what extent does this accord with the ABM Treaty?

[Akhromeyev] In the first place, everything that the Soviet Union is doing to improve its system for warning of missile attack accords with the ABM Treaty. In contemporary circumstances, in the world in which are living, the system for warning against missile attack is one of the most important warning systems. For this reason, under the treaty both the Soviet Union and the United States have the right to improve this system --

within a certain framework, within certain limits. So, I repeat, we are doing this within certain limits. As regards the specific stations in the system for warning of missiles attack about which you are asking, I can say: Yes. They are being built close to the borders of the Soviet Union. They are directed outwards. Their purpose is to replace obsolete stations that existed earlier. All this is being done in complete accord with the ABM Treaty.

[Reporter] I'm from Czechoslovak Radio. In your view, what opportunities for progress over the question of monitoring the ban on nuclear tests are presented by the meeting of experts, which was proposed by the Delhi Six?

[Vorontsov] In addition to this proposal, the Delhi Six made several specific points that they could discuss with representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union.

They do, indeed, include interesting proposals on how to make use of the possibilities open to these countries, how to exploit the possibilities presented by a worldwide seismic network for checking that explosions are not being carried out, and how to organize on-site inspection. These are all questions contained in the Delhi Six's special document, which was prepared in Mexico. They are being studied with interest by Soviet specialists. But, of course, they can only be implemented if the United States agrees to sit down together with experts from the Delhi Six, with Soviet experts, to study their proposals and also the wide range of other ideas and proposals that have been made in both the United States and the Soviet Union. I have in mind the scientific world.

[Gerasimov] There are no more questions. Our press conference is over. Thank you for your attention.

#### TASS Report

PM261122 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Aug 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Moscow Press Conference"]

[Text] A press conference was held at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center on 25 August for Soviet and foreign journalists in connection with the statement made on Soviet television on 18 August by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. It was conducted by Yu. M. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister; Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister; and G.I. Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration.

Yu. M. Vorontsov, who spoke at the press conference, said: M.S. Gorbachev's statement on important issues of disarmament, above all on one of the key problems of international policy — that of ending nuclear tests, and the decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions until 1 January 1987 are now at the center of attention in the world.

The vast majority of governments, political and public figures, and ordinary people in all countries are coming out resolutely in favor of an immediate end to nuclear tests. They are opposed only by a small, but stubborn and influential, group of individuals in the United States who advocate that nuclear explosions continue to shake our planet.

A marked nervousness now prevails in Washington, and contradictory arguments are being put forward in favor of the United States continuing its nuclear explosions. [Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 26 August carries a similar report that adds the following here: Thus White House Chief of Staff D. Regan declares that the United States is supposedly not against a treaty on a general and complete nuclear weapon test ban, but cannot accept this without a proper system of verification. Other spokesmen for the U.S. President reject the verification thesis and say frankly that the United States needs tests in order to improve its nuclear weapons. People in Washington are also confused in their arguments about who is "overtaking" whom in the nuclear arms sphere.]

In essence the United States has no reasonable explanations of why it does not want to join in the Soviet moratorium, unless, of course, you admit that the United States needs nuclear explosions exclusively in order to continue the nuclear arms race in a vain attempt to achieve military superiority. [IZVESTIYA adds: And of course, verification is not holding things up. The Soviet Union has proposed, basically, any forms of verification, even those that are in our view superfluous, but the United States, all the same, will not accept an end to nuclear tests. As is now clear to everyone, in this connection Washington is not motivated by its concern about verification, but by the attempt to provide a cover for continuing work to create new forms and types of nuclear weapons. One such aim, since recently, is the preparation for the use of the energy of a nuclear explosion in implementing the "star wars" program.]

I can say in all seriousness that for the Soviet Union the problem of verification of an end to nuclear tests does not exist. This is plain to see, if only from the example of the joint Soviet-American experiment in verification carried out by scientists in the Semipalatinsk region. The agreement to conduct the experiment was supported by the Soviet Government, which expressed readiness to do everything to promote its implementation on our territory. [paragraph continues]

The U.S. Administration has yet to display a similar readiness regarding the holding in parallel of a similar experiment in verification on American territory.

[The Soviet Union places a high value on the joint activity of the heads of state and government of the six states (the "Delhi Six") -- Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden, and Tanzania -- in favor of the quick ending of nuclear explosions. We have already expressed our readiness to take up the proposal of the "Delhi Six" on assistance in the verification of an end to nuclear tests, including on-site inspections, provided, naturally, that it is accepted by the other side too. We have also expressed a positive attitude toward the proposal to organize a meeting of experts from those six countries with Soviet and American experts, as was mentioned in yesterday's reply from M.S. Gorbachev to the heads of state and government of the six countries.]

All the grounds now exist, through a Soviet-American moratorium and then an agreement or treaty, to halt once and for all the "nuclear fever" on earth. After all, the moratorium question should not be considered in isolation, solely as a measure aimed at ending nuclear explosions, but in the context of the general problem of delivering mankind from nuclear weapons, as a kind of prologue to total nuclear disarmament. The ending of nuclear explosions could, figuratively speaking, be one of the threads that could be pulled in order to begin unraveling the whole complicated knot of the nuclear disarmament problem. If there are no such explosions, new nuclear weapons will not be created, and major limitations will be created for the existing weapons. That will apply equally to the United States and the USSR. One would like to hope that ultimately common sense will prevail all the same in Washington, and that the historic opportunity along the path to ending the arms race will not be wasted.

We repeat that the attainment of an agreement with the United States on ending nuclear tests with full verification, including on-site inspections, is possible, and in the near future. Such an agreement could be signed at a Soviet-American summit meeting which, as M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has stated repeatedly, is possible provided that an appropriate political atmosphere is created and the fruitfulness of the meeting is ensured.

Answers were also given to numerous questions from journalists.

#### Question, Answer Session

PM271116 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Aug 86 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Ending Nuclear Tests. Press Conference in Moscow:"]

[Text] As has already been reported, a press conference in connection with CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's 18 August statement on Soviet television was held for Soviet and foreign journalists on 25 August at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center. It was conducted by Yu. M. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister; Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister; and G.I. Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate.

Answers were given to numerous questions from journalists.

Question: In speaking of M.S. Gorbachev's 18 August statement, both American officials and a number of U.S. press organs are now trying to reduce the matter to a correspondence between leaders, and some fragmentary leaks and claims are appearing that R. Reagan's last message to M.S. Gorbachev contains constructive proposals and solutions to a number of disarmament questions, including the question of ending nuclear weapon tests. What can you say about this?

Answer: The correspondence between the two leaders is confidential in nature, and we cannot reveal its content here.

But it should be said that since M.S. Gorbachev's statement, Washington has indeed begun to use "targeted leaks" to try to divert the American Public and also the world public away from the question raised in the statement of the U.S. subscribing to the moratorium on all nuclear explosions and without delay concluding an agreement to end them. In addition, these leaks are clearly designed to mislead people and outwardly present Washington's position in a more favorable guise and to hint at its constructive nature, when it does not, in fact, exist. Since the leaks come from U.S. officials, it is difficult for people in this connection to get to the bottom of the real state of affairs regarding very important questions of profound interest not only to the USSR and the United States but also to the entire world public.

If you want to know my opinion, said Yu.M. Vorontsov, who was replying to this question, I personally think that in this case it is, perhaps, better not to play with "leaks" but to inform the world public of the actual contents of the letters exchanged by M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan, so that people would be able to judge for themselves the true nature of this correspondence. But, of course, it is not up to you and me to solve this question. It is up to the two countries' leaders themselves to reveal or not to reveal the substance of their correspondence.

Question: Could you explain what M.S. Gorbachev meant when he declared that the USSR will find an answer that will make the "star wars" program worthless?

Answer: When people speak of U.S. preparations for "star wars," they mean its preparations to deploy a multiechelon system for the ABM defense of U.S. territory and to create [sozdaniye] and deploy space-strike arms.

The purpose of the U.S. preparations for "star wars" is to make the USSR's strategic nuclear forces worthless, that is, to disarm the Soviet Union and thereby enable the United States to constantly threaten the Soviet Union with a massive nuclear strike.

There are two sides to the U.S. implementation of the program to deploy a multiechelon ABM system and space-strike arms. On the political plane it undermines the existing equilibrium and treaties, leads the arms limitation talks into an impasse, undermines faith in their reality, creates strategic chaos instead of stability, and sharply increases the danger of nuclear war.

On the purely military plane this program undermines the strategic equilibrium that exists today.

If the United States continues work on implementing the "star wars" plans, the USSR will have to take corresponding measures. And, if necessary, we will quickly find a response -- and it will not be what the United States expects. It will be a response that will make the "star wars" program worthless. M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, clearly declared this.

As a military specialist, S.F. Akhromeyev, who was replying to this question, pointed out, I can say with good reason that the United States does not have a monopoly on scientific and technical progress in military matters. The development of science and technology in the military-technical sphere has reached such a level that the eternal struggle between "the sword and the shield," between defensive and offensive means, is being resolved today in not one but many directions. Reliable means of counteraction can be found to every action.

The USSR could undertake an identical response to U.S. actions to undermine equilibrium by creating [sozdaniye] an ABM defense for the country and space-strike arms. The USSR is capable of doing this.

It is also possible to improve strategic offensive arms to such an extent as to make the program for ABM defense of U.S. territory fabulously expensive and extremely difficult to implement.

Other responses that will make the "star wars" program worthless are also possible.

Question: A considerable number of reports have currently been appearing in the West claiming that final agreement has already been reached on the timing of a new summit meeting. What can you say on this?

Answer: Yes, there are such reports. Some people in the United States are even citing allegedly precise dates for such a meeting. What can be said on this?

As yet there is no agreement on a specific date for a new meeting.

The Soviet approach to a summit meeting is well-known. We are for such a meeting, but it must obligatorily culminate in substantial accords in the field of disarmament. There is no point in holding a fruitless meeting. This, our well-known position, remains unchanged.

Question: Washington says that the USSR can afford a long moratorium on nuclear tests because it has overtaken the United States by a long way in this sphere. Is this so?

Answer: Such statements by Washington do not correspond to reality. The facts indicate that the United States is the leader in terms of the number of nuclear explosions. It has carried out more nuclear explosions than all the nuclear powers put together. The United States has carried out roughly one-third more nuclear explosions than the Soviet Union.

It has done so in each individual environment (in the atmosphere, under ground, and under water). To take just the past 2 years: In 1984 the sides carried out a roughly equal number of nuclear weapon tests; in 1985 the United States conducted approximately 20 explosions, and the USSR -- before the introduction of the moratorium -- 9. During the year of the Soviet moratorium the United States has exploded 18 nuclear devices. These are the facts. Where, then, is the lag the United States speaks of? Those who speak of this want the United States to retain the possibility of improving and creating [sozdaniye] new kinds of nuclear weapons and, thus, continuing the arms race.

Answers were also given to other questions from journalists.

/7358

CSO: 5200/1539

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

JPRS-TAC-86-075  
18 September 1986

NETHERLANDS PAPER ON U.S. OBJECTIONS TO TESTING MORATORIUM

PM211410 Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 19 Aug 86 p 7

[Editorial: "A Historic Chance"]

[Text] Party leader Gorbachev seems to be determined to ensure for himself the maximum amount of support from world opinion at his upcoming summit conference with President Reagan. It would seem that with this support he intends to press at any price for agreements on limits — or, even better, a ban — on underground nuclear tests. With his latest publicity stunt — the extension of the moratorium on such tests until the end of the year announced yesterday — he has put his adversary under great pressure. If the U.S. President is not prepared to accept the outstretched hand and reach a compromise on nuclear testing, confidence in him will again fall, in the United States as well as among his allies.

Nevertheless as long as hawks like Weinberger and Perle hold sway in Washington such a compromise remains unlikely. Even last month Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Director Kenneth Adelman told a news conference: "We are not interested in a total ban on nuclear tests. We have told them (the Russians — editor) that hundreds of times. We have given them the reasons for this. As long as we have nuclear arms we want to make them as safe and as reliable as possible."

This argument — testing is necessary for safety and reliability — sounds less than convincing. Nuclear tests could at most give an idea of the degree of reliability of a whole arsenal, not of the reliability of each weapon. Also, this reliability could be increased by constructing the weapons in such a way that they do not need to be tested. And finally there are computer programs which are able to accurately simulate explosions triggered by lasers. Thanks to such models it is possible these days to test nuclear arms without unleashing the fires of Hiroshima (or fires many times stronger) a hundred meters underground several



times a year.

Washington is also fond of using the difficulty of effectively verifying a test ban as an argument against such a ban. This argument too is easy to demolish. As a result of developments over the years the possibility of seismographic verification has increased to such an extent that a worldwide network of stations would be able without fail to register even small-scale secret underground explosions at a considerable distance. Now that the Soviet Union has also declared its readiness to allow verification on its own territory, the final obstacle to effective checks seems to have been removed.

All these U.S. objections primarily seem to be intended to serve as a smoke screen to hide the real reasons for opposition to a nuclear test ban. For such a test ban would also make impossible the testing necessary for the development of a defensive shield in space. An x-ray laser beam fed by small nuclear explosions remains a subsidiary part of the SDI project. And this is precisely the option which President Reagan wants to keep open at the negotiations on arms control.

Reagan has tied his prestige as leader of the West to this option, about whose technical or economic viability there is total uncertainty. All the ongoing negotiations on arms control have been subordinated to this. There is a threat that even the truly historic chance of putting the brakes on the arms race through a total test ban which the Soviets — for the first time in decades — are offering will not be seized on for these reasons. Nevertheless through such a ban the strike power of the present nuclear arsenals — and on both sides equally — would be reduced in a relatively easy way. It would be impossible to develop a new generation of nuclear arms. And in addition other countries — Pakistan, Argentina, Brazil — would be prevented from manufacturing nuclear arms.

In Geneva in early September the talks on nuclear testing will continue between U.S. and Soviet negotiators in preparation for the summit. It is clear that after yesterday evening's verbal fireworks Gorbachev will not be able to make do with anything less than a compromise at this summit. It must also be expected of the Soviets that they are ready to reach concrete agreements on verification. It must be expected of the Americans that in their dreams of some remote "star wars" they do not lose sight of the dangers of a further nuclear escalation here and now.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2751

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

PNG'S FOREIGN MINISTER PROMOTES NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE

Port Moresby PAPUA NEW GUINEA POST COURIER in English 15 Aug 86 p 11

[Article by Noel Pascoe]

[Text]

**SOUTH Pacific countries will exert as much pressure as they can to get France and other major powers to respect the proposed nuclear-free zone in the region.**

**PNG's Foreign Affairs Minister Mr Vagi said this on his return to Port Moresby yesterday from the annual South Pacific Forum.**

He did not say what kind of pressure could be applied to the major powers.

The South Pacific Nuclear-Free Zone Treaty could be effective as of December 1 this year if another three countries ratify the treaty and its protocols.

Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu refused to sign or ratify the treaty saying it is not comprehensive enough. Tonga has not yet indicated its position.

Mr Vagi said PNG, Solomons and Vanuatu could review their position if changes were made to make the treaty more effective.

"The treaty does not cover dumping and storage of wastes and the passage of nuclear-powered vessels," he said. We would like to see all these taken together and not separately."

Mr Vagi said PNG, Solomons, and Vanuatu could review their position if changes were

made to make the treaty more effective.

Mr Vagi said the treaty could be made effective if the changes were made and the major powers agreed to ratify the protocols. Asked if that was likely to happen, Mr Vagi said: "We will be trying our best to get France and the others to sign."

Mr Vagi praised Soviet Union's call for a nuclear-free Pacific. "The Soviet Union is one of the countries who are to sign the protocols. If they say that and are genuine, we are very happy, and the US, China, France and others will follow suit."

Mr Vagi said the pre-Forum "summit" in Goroka between PNG, Solomons and Vanuatu helped to consolidate thinking in the Forum on New Caledonia and underlined the urgency of taking action now.

He said the three nations had played an active and constructive role at the Forum and contributed significantly to the debate and decision on New Caledonia.

/13046

CSO: 5200/4324

END